Vol. LXXIX No. 4 October, 1928

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE 337
The Most Rev. AUSTIN DOWLING, D.D., Archbishop of St Paul, Minnesota.
THE SANCTITY OF SOEUR THERESE OF LISIEUX 355
ALPHONSE R. VONDERAHE, M.D., University of Cincinnati, Ohio.
ST. PAUL'S HYMN OF LOVE 363
The Rev. EMMET P. O'CONNELL, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri.
THE THEOLOGY OF A DOLLAR BILL 373
The Rev. CHARLES F. KELLER, J.C.D., Allentown, Pennsylvania.
SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE EXODUS 382
The Rev. JEROME D. HANNAN, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
SCANDALIZING THE LITTLE ONES 393
The Rev. J. ELLIOT ROSS, C.S.P., New York City.
PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENTS 403
THE IMMORALITY OF CONTRACEPTION 408
The Very Rev. JOHN A. RYAN, S.T.D., Catholic University of America.
RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IN CONVENT CHAPELS 412
HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE OPERATION 414
RETRACTION BY A MASON BEFORE RECONCILIATION 415
RECENT BIBLE STUDY 418
The Rev. WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J., Pontifical Biblical Institute, Jerusalem, Palestine.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

1305 Arch Street
PHILADELPHIA

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1928: American Ecclesiastical Review

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Veritas Company, Ltd., 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1904, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and have the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✣ ✣ ✣

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✣ ✣ ✣

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich, mellow, wholesome character, are ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✣ ✣ ✣

For the convenience of the Clergy throughout the country the COVICK Mass Wines may be obtained from

Fee Brothers
21-27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

The I. Donnelly Company
408-410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

J. Redmond Covick
33 South Wells Street
Chicago, Ill.

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

or direct from

The Covick Company, 330 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

CONTENTS CONTINUED

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Prenuptial Agreements 403
The Immorality of Contraception. (*The Very Rev. John A. Ryan, S. T. D., Washington, D. C.*) 408
Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in Convent Chapels 412
Holy Communion before Operation 414
Retraction by a Mason before Reconciliation 415
Boys Camping over Week-End without Mass 416
Adoption of Protestant Children by a Catholic 417

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study
The Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., Pontifical Biblical Institute, Jerusalem, Palestine 418

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Saudreau—Strickland: The Life of Union with God 431
Hedley: Lex Levitarum 432
Pégues Commentaire Francais Litteral de la Somme Théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin 432
Heuser: The Archbishop's Pocketbook 434
O'Grady: An Introduction to Social Work 435
Cronin: A Primer of the Principles of Social Science 439
D'Alès: Baptéme et Confirmation 440
Chometon: Le Christ, Vie et Lumiére 441
Mere Marie du Saint Sacrement: Une Retraite 441
De Bruyne: S. Thomas d'Aquin 442
Christiani: Saint Irenée 443
Brunhes: La Foi et sa Justification Rationnelle 443
Schurhammer—Eble: St. Francis Xavier 444

LITERARY CHAT 445

BOOKS RECEIVED 447

NEW EDITION

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

olim in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

Dolphin Press - - - 1305 Arch Street, Philadelphia

Firms with Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	**JOHN MURPHY CO.**, Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	**BIGELOW KENNARD & CO.**, 511 Washington Street. **THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., INC.**, 62-64 Essex Street. **MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY**, 22 Chauncy Street. **PATRICK J. GILL**, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) **JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO.**, 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. **ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO.**, 984 Milwaukee Ave. **D. B. HANSEN & SONS**, 27 N. Franklin Street. **EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY**, 819-823 Rush Street. **SPAULDING & CO.**, Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St. **HUBERT GOTZES, INC.**, 1536 North Clark Street.
CINCINNATI:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 429 Main Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	**JOHN W. WINTERICH, INC.**, 1707 East Ninth Street.
COLUMBUS:	**JOHN W. WINTERICH, INC.**, 80 South Fourth Street.
DENVER:	**JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE**, 1638-40 Tremont St.
MILWAUKEE:	**BERGS MANUFACTURING CO.**, 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. **DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO.**, 413 Broadway. **A. WERNER**, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	**BENZIGER BROTHERS**, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) **K. BEETAR, INC.**, 258 Broadway. **THE FEELEY CO.**, 10 W. 50th Street. **THE GORHAM COMPANY**, 5th Avenue and 47th Street **WILLIAM J. HIRTEN COMPANY, INC.**, 25 Barclay Street. **FR. PUSTET CO.**, 52 Barclay Street. **RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO.**, 2 West 45th Street. **THE C. WILDERMANN CO.**, 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	**KOLEY AND SON**, 2512 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	**H. L. KILNER & CO.**, 1708 Market Street. **J. J. McDERMOTT**, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. **LOUIS J. MEYER**, 804-806 Walnut Street. **F. C. PEQUIGNOT**, 908 Land Title Bldg., Broad and Chestnut Sts. **FRANK QUIN & CO.**, 46 North 9th Street. **HERMAN J. WOLF**, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. **WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO.**, 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	**E. J. LETZKUS**, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	**THE GORHAM COMPANY**, Elmwood. **W. J. SULLIVAN CO.**, 96 Jefferson Street. **JOSEPH TALLY**, 506-512 Westminster Street.
ST. LOUIS:	**B. HERDER BOOK CO.**, 17 South Broadway.
ST. PAUL:	**THE E. M. LOHMANN CO.**, 385 St. Peter St.
SAN FRANCISCO:	**ECCLESIASTICAL SUPPLY ASSOCIATION**, 328-330 Stockton St.
TOLEDO:	**THE GERITY-WHITAKER COMPANY**, 10 South Superior St.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. IX.—(LXXIX).—OCTOBER, 1928.—No. 4.

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE.

THROUGH the necessity of circumstance, the Catholic Church in the United States was founded and developed on the local, parish unit. What traditions it had of a universal and therefore of a national mission for the country to which it came were carried over from other countries. The particular groups of Catholics found those traditions both a stimulus and a handicap. They safely encased the Catholic faith: they prevented or made tardy the flow of that faith into wider and broader channels that shaped the thought, the purpose, the character of the nation as a whole.

This phenomenon carried with it no blame. Our country itself had no unalterable, uniform purpose or character. Even that which is the fundamental of the nation—unity—was not accepted nor interpreted in the same way by all the constituent States. Our country has built far better than it knew. Massachusetts publicly claimed in 1812 her right to leave the Union. Lincoln's declaration that union was the keystone of national life appealed successfully only because the explicit consciousness of its truth, not at all clear to the founders, had come to the people seventy-five years later. The national life itself sprang from the fidelity of local groups. The founders of the Catholic faith saw, as their first obligation, the preservation and nurture of that faith in those under their care. The dangers and temptations immediately outside of that circle permitted no risk. The needs of the flock prohibited other interests.

The root of strength remains to-day and must ever remain what it was then — the local, immediate group, the parish. The well-equipped parish of to-day, with its church and school, priests' house and sisters' convent, is the source that both begets and feeds those strong Catholic men and women who serve the Church and the country in places of high or low degree.

The groups multiplied. Their activities, problems, and opportunities increased. Inevitably came a mutual sharing in common civic, social and business life. The importance of the diocese as a whole grew more evident: and the obligations of the people to care for the welfare of the diocese became one with their obligations toward the parish. For the very priest who was their pastor in Christ was educated and trained by the diocese: the standards of their schools were maintained by the diocese. What they received they would, in turn, give. The strength of the parish depended upon the strength of the diocese. Through the right evaluation of the parish, Catholics were gaining a larger and truer insight into their Catholic obligations to the diocese, to the Church universal in its common works, to the country in its developing national character, and to its common traditions and common labors that must be moulded and carried out before it would know the fulness of its strength.

As we were established through the sacrifices and generosity of missionaries — the Church in the United States was on a missionary basis until 1908 — so has our interest in the missions both at home and abroad helped to keep alive and fresh in our souls, our Catholic obligation to the wider needs of the Church. The same interest has been no small factor in the making of America.

The historian may criticize the labors of our fathers and urge that a keener appreciation of our place and our responsibility in the national life should have come earlier: that the position of the Church would be stronger and that America would be in better estate had it so come decades ago. Had we such a consciousness and a corresponding organization, that historian might state, the Catholic Philippines would not have been subjected, as they are to-day, under the action of our own Government, to de-Christianized education. Whether the indictment be true or not, two facts stand out clearly: the Church

in the United States has providentially been blessed with prosperity, with increase; the Church in the United States will fail in its duty if it does not meet to the full the opportunity as well as the obligation now facing it.

That we seek to meet it fully is evidenced by our answer to the challenge which the events of 1917 presented to the Catholic Church in the United States. In all that we as Catholics were called upon to do, in the care of souls and the spiritual interests of the Church, in service to our country, no partial or local attitude was taken, but one of national extent and of common resources, of common help and common problems. We met the challenge not as many and separated, but as one and united. For the assembling and care of the Army and Navy chaplains, a Bishop General, the present Cardinal Hayes, was appointed with the approval of the Holy See. With extraordinary zeal and ability, he organized his Army vicariates over night: eventually enlisted and directed almost one thousand priests as chaplains. Every diocese coöperated. The result was a revelation to ourselves of our strength, our responsibility, and our opportunity.

To redeem that pledge given by the Archbishops to the President of the United States — that the Catholic body of the country would devote its full, united resources to the country's welfare — the Archbishops organized the National Catholic War Council, authorized to supervise and unify the Catholic lay activities of the United States in war and post-war service. The almost numberless activities, most prominent of which was the national and international work of the Knights of Columbus, were unified under the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic War Council. That Council was officially recognized by the United States Government as the channel of Catholic activity and it is specifically mentioned, as one of the seven great welfare organizations of the United States, in the letter of President Wilson authorizing the nation-wide common War Drive. Through its work, the Catholic body, and the Knights of Columbus especially, shared in the receipts of that great "drive". Credit should always be given and is given here to the late Bishop Muldoon, Chairman of the National Catholic War Council, for his extraordinary leadership in a hitherto untried position and in a work

that put to the fullest test, before the eyes of all our fellow citizens, the worth of Catholic faith and Catholic service in the well-being of our country.

This work of nation-wide organization on the part of our Catholic people was undertaken in a time of crisis. It was a new experience. The demands made upon our time and our resources and the great sacrifices incurred left little room for reflection on what had been accomplished. The great fruits of that organization effort were to be realized and capitalized later and in happier times.

When peace came, we were called upon to decide what to do with the great organization of our Catholic resources made necessary by the war. Catholics had developed a consciousness of greater strength and responsibility. They had come to a larger participation in the religious and spiritual life of the country. Were they now to disband and to depend upon scattered and divided efforts, or combine and develop this new strength as a means of further service to the Church and the nation? Fortunately a wise and farseeing spiritual leadership selected the latter course.

In February, 1919, seventy-seven Bishops of the United States met in Washington to celebrate the Golden Jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons. At that meeting the now Cardinal Cerretti appeared and expressed the wish of His Holiness, the then Pope, Benedict XV, that the Bishops should make plans for an annual meeting whereat they would take common counsel on matters of general import and establish definite departments that would, under their supervision and direction, carry the work assigned. The Bishops immediately and unanimously decided to act in accordance with the Holy Father's request. To form such an organization a survey committee of Bishops, known as the General Committee on Catholic Affairs and Interests, was appointed by the Chairman, Cardinal Gibbons, with orders to make a survey and to report at the next meeting of the Bishops to be held the following September.

In the meanwhile, on 10 April, 1919, the Holy Father, Benedict XV, having received word of the action of the Bishops at their February meeting, wrote a letter to all the Bishops of the United States in which he congratulated them on the action taken, pointed out how the progress of Catholicism is promoted

by these frequent assemblies of the Bishops: how through the wisdom gathered from such assemblies "the wise direction of the Bishops" may be helpful to the social and educational movements of the day.

This General Committee on Catholic Affairs and Interests, after diligent labor and country-wide conference, reported at the September meeting. Ninety-three Bishops attended. That meeting resolved that an organization of the Bishops be formed to be known as the National Catholic Welfare Council. It further decided that "an Administrative Committee, composed of seven members of the hierarchy, be elected by the National Catholic Welfare Council to transact all business between meetings of the National Catholic Welfare Council and to carry out the wishes of the National Catholic Welfare Council as expressed in its annual sessions".

The same meeting directed the establishment of the departments to be directly under the Administrative Committee and that the Administrative Committee should report fully on the work of every department to the National Catholic Welfare Council.

By secret ballot the meeting chose, out of fifteen candidates, the seven members of the Administrative Committee. Within a few days, that Administrative Committee began the work of organizing the departments; selected headquarters at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington; and every year since, each succeeding Administrative Committee has reported to the National Catholic Welfare Conference (the title was changed from "Council" to "Conference" in 1923).

A full report of the meeting in September 1919 and its action was sent to the Holy See by Cardinal Gibbons. In response, Cardinal Gasparri wrote, 13 November, 1919, to Cardinal Gibbons:

> The Holy Father has learned with the most lively interest the good news communicated to him by Your Eminence in a recent letter of the eleventh of October about the meeting held at Washington by the hierarchy.
>
> His Holiness expressed the wish that the resolutions adopted at the meeting you have mentioned will bear the desired fruits to the Church in that country and as a pledge of the aid of heaven he imparts most heartily to Your Eminence and to your venerable

colleagues in the hierarchy the Apostolic Blessing which you besought.

The subsequent Pastoral Letter of the American hierarchy stated: "The task . . . is so laborious and yet so promising of results, that we may surely expect, with the Divine assistance and the loyal support of our clergy and people, to promote more effectually the glory of God, the interests of the Church, and the welfare of our country."

All the essentials of the plan of organization of the National Catholic Welfare Conference were laid down by almost unanimous vote by the Bishops at their first meeting.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference is the Bishops of the United States, meeting yearly at Washington for mutual conference, deliberation, and decision on matters of general public concern, on the defence and welfare of the Church in the United States. It has no existence apart from the hierarchy. But it is not the hierarchy of the United States meeting for the purpose of ecclesiastical legislation and authorized recommendations thereon. Such would be a plenary council.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference is a voluntary association of the Bishops. It has not and never can have any mandatory or legislative power. Nothing can be done in a diocese except by the permission of the Ordinary. But every Bishop gains by contact with his fellow Bishops and the very statement of common problems and the discussions thereon are in themselves helpful. This is the great service which the National Catholic Welfare Conference renders to the Bishops of the United States. Up to 1919 they had never met in such conference.

It offers an equal service to the Catholic people of the United States. The Bishops at their meeting give their best in mutual deliberation and recommend their conclusions to the Catholic body of the country as the most helpful they can give on safeguarding and promoting Catholic interests. In the matters of public concern and civic relationship Catholic unity can be expressed only by such common guidance, and in turn by the coöperation of all Catholic organizations. That all in such matters of external, national interest may act together, under becoming leadership, is the function of the National Catholic

Welfare Conference. Without it our lay organizations are not united in action, are in danger of assuming, through necessity, a leadership which is not their proper function. They would, otherwise, be almost compelled to make their own definitions of Catholic action and Catholic policy. Moreover, the common contribution which they might all give when acting together would be lost or weakened.

With no intent to lessen, but rather to deepen their responsibility and increase their initiative, and make more present the sense of their vital part in the Catholic whole, did the Bishops decide upon the full departmental organization of the N. C. W. C. They, in fact, have desired our Catholic organizations to take up voluntarily those common tasks and problems which are properly their share in the organization and welfare of the Church. It is to carry out and sustain this voluntary acceptance of responsibility by the laity that the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women were formed, and to this end were made dependent on their own resources. Thus, the National Catholic Welfare Conference is in all its parts a voluntary organization seeking through a common spirit of Catholic coöperation to serve and promote the cause of Catholic unity.

The N. C. W. C. functions during the year between annual meetings, through the Administrative Committee, composed of seven Bishops, elected yearly at the meeting of the Conference. The Committee has full power to conduct the departments and to name the personnel thereof. These departments are: Executive, Education, Social Action, Legal, Press and Publicity, Lay Organizations. The last is sub-divided into the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women.

Each department has as its immediate head an episcopal chairman, one of the Bishops of the Administrative Committee assigned thereto by the Committee. In administering his department, he follows the general policy of the Administrative Committee. Each department has its special field; overlapping is avoided, and general activities are unified through a General Secretary appointed by the Committee. No action may be taken by any department or member of the staff of any department without the authorization of the episcopal chair-

man of that department. The episcopal chairman thereof is responsible for the conduct of all the members of the staff of his department. No approval to any common measure of any kind is given without the authorization of the Administrative Committee.

The expenses of the Administrative Committee and its departments, with the exception of the Department of Lay Organizations, are met by a yearly budget voted at the general meeting of the Bishops and subscribed to by voluntary contributions from the Ordinaries of the country. Last year, 1926-27, ninety-seven Bishops contributed generously to the support of the work. Of this budget nothing is received by the National Council of Catholic Men or the National Council of Catholic Women. Both these organizations must meet all their expenses of every kind from funds which they receive from their affiliated organizations.

In the space at my disposal I will endeavor to give a broad outline of the work of the departments and the more notable services they have rendered.

The Department of Lay Organizations is of two parts, the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women, both under the one episcopal chairman. Both are agencies for making known to our Catholic laity the policies and decisions given by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Each seeks to coördinate the activities of the Catholic men's or the Catholic women's organizations of the country. It is a cardinal principle of the National Council of Catholic Men and National Council of Catholic Women that they do not supplant any established organization and they can operate in a diocese only by the permission of the Ordinary.

Both organizations are accomplishing work of vast importance—in securing common action when needed, by all men's or women's organizations; through national convention and daily contact, bringing home the benefit to the entire body and to every part of that body, of common organization. Knowledge of the wider national movements, so often affecting our religious and moral life as individuals and as a people, is secured by the national headquarters of both organizations. Lay representation in such movements and conferences repre-

sentative of them, is the only channel by which Catholic truth and the Catholic position may be made known and defended. One has but to review for a moment the vicious, well-financed anti-Christian propaganda of birth control, or sterilization legislation, or the denial of the sanctity of marriage, or the public temptations to the youth of the day, to realize that both N. C. C. M. and N. C. C. W. are opportune and far-reaching channels of Catholic influence stretching out through all our Catholic organizations, and capable of invigorating our social life with the principles of Christian faith and Christian standards. When one remembers that the general guidance of the activities of both divisions of this Department of Lay Organizations comes from the Bishops, he grows enthusiastic at this witness and expression of Catholic oneness, of Catholic solidarity.

The ideal and standard which are set forth here and which undoubtedly were the mind of the Bishops when they directed the organization of the department of lay activities, will be reached only as the consciousness of common responsibility increases and deepens in our Catholic lay organizations. But the machinery and the process for such a growth and development have been placed in our hands.

Department of Education. The Catholic school represents one of the major interests of the Church in America. Over 2,500,000 children are now attending these schools, which range from the primary grades to the university. The Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference was organized to meet the needs of this school system for advice and assistance, which could be supplied adequately only by a well-staffed and scientifically conducted central clearing-house of educational information. It functions through a Bureau of Education which gathers statistical data, makes surveys, places teachers and professors, and stimulates knowledge of and interest in the progress of the Catholic school. It acts, likewise, as a connecting-link between the Catholic school system and national organizations of an educational character and the Federal Bureau of Education. Moreover, since the private school is subjected to attack on many sides, the Bureau keeps in close touch with educational legislation, State and Federal, and organizes a defence of the rights

of the religious school whenever such rights are likely to be jeopardized by unfriendly legislation. The Bureau of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is a purely advisory body, exercising no control over the Catholic system, which is governed locally. Its advice is gratuitous, and the best obtainable, due to the simple fact that its executive committee is made up of the leading Catholic educators in the United States, who serve without pay or expense, in the sole interest of better Catholic schools.

Legal Department. The Legal Department is not, as its title might indicate, a department that gives advice on legal matters. Fortunately, the Administrative Committee has at its service experienced Catholic lawyers who are ever ready to give, without cost to the Conference, their advice and their help on questions that demand expert knowledge of the law. The Legal Department keeps the Administrative Committee informed of such Federal and State legislative matters as concern Catholic interests or have a bearing on public morality or affect the general interests of religion, of education, or of any other leading Catholic question.

No action in any legislative matter is taken by the Legal Department. The direction of any such action is the function of the Administrative Committee.

The Department keeps itself informed of changes in regulations on matters that may be of immediate concern to Catholics or Catholic institutions; the Federal regulations, for example, concerning the manufacture and distribution of sacramental wine. The representatives of the Department are prepared and ready to straighten out difficulties when they arise with regard to securing sacramental wine. Government officials are, in turn, helped by having a source of information on Catholic needs in the matter. Pastors, heads of seminaries, religious institutions, are constantly importing religious books, altars, church equipment. How the tariff affects such importations is important. Time and again the Legal Department has been of inestimable service in this matter. For example, last year the United States Treasury Department, on representations made by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, ruled that hereafter altars and other church accessories imported for use in chapels at colleges and hospitals may be

brought into the country duty-free. The Department gives its service free to every priest or Catholic institution that comes to it for aid. There are numerous other questions concerning Federal law and regulations which affect this or that diocese, or all the dioceses, to which the Department is asked to give its attention and service. The Department, moreover, keeps itself informed of such State legislation as may be of special interest to Catholic organizations, and, in turn, gives such information of the record in various States, for example, of legislation on birth control and on sterilization of the unfit—as may be desired.

Department of Publicity, Press and Literature. The Bishops established the Department of Publicity, Press and Literature to build up the Catholic Press of the United States; to help the Catholic journals and enable their readers to have not only local news, but the Catholic news of the world and the Catholic interpretation and explanation of current events affecting the thought and the institutions of the day. That Press Service is fed by correspondents in this country and in the principal countries of the world. Several times a week it sends out to over ninety subscribing papers news matter totaling 40,000 words a week. It has, moreover, a daily telegraph service. Recognition of its position as a News Service has been given by the United States government's extending to it the privilege of the Senate and House Press Gallery and the presence of its representative at Presidential interviews.

The Press Service, as such, does not publish. It supplies to the editor of the particular journal, news and feature articles. The Press Service has had its influence on the great secular journals of the country. Known as an authority on Catholic news, its word is often sought by metropolitan journals of recognized power.

The Service is immediately under the care of a trained staff at the national headquarters.

Department of Social Action. The purpose of the Department of Social Action may be expressed in the words of the 1919 Pastoral of all the Bishops of the United States: "The security of the nation and the efficiency of government for the general weal depend largely upon the standards which are adopted, and the practices which are admitted, in social rela-

tions. This is characteristic of a democracy, where the makers of law are commissioned to do the will of the people. In matters pertaining to morality, legislation will not rise above the level established by the general tone and tenor of society. It is necessary, then, for the preservation of national life, that social morality, in its usage and sanction, be sound and steadfast and pure."

The Social Action Department endeavors to make known and to have more effectively applied the principles of Christian justice to the practical affairs of life. It has done so by special publications, by lectures, by a weekly news-sheet. It has undertaken the work of survey in many dioceses. To it we are indebted for the citizenship programme, the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, the Catholic Rural Life Bureau, the Catholic Association for International Peace. Without it we would lack the means of asserting and defending the Catholic position in those immediate affairs of living men and women that greatly determine their moral and religious life.

Bureau of Immigration. Perhaps nothing in our Catholic history is so inexplicable as our neglect of the immigrant. The N. C. W. C. established in 1920 its Bureau of Immigration. The work of this Bureau since its inception exalts and depresses: exalts because it reveals what can be done, how urgent the need, how many souls are thus saved to the Faith; depresses, because one thinks of how many we have lost, and how even now we have not reached much below the surface of the problem. The Bureau has its representatives at Washington, where the entire work is directed and all the appeal cases handled. It has its workers at Ellis Island, its contact with Catholic organizations abroad, and its follow-up work now organized in eighty-five dioceses.

Bureau of Publicity and Information. The Press Department, as we have already stated, is a news service; it does not enter into propaganda of any kind. Many phases of Catholic activity, however, which may lack immediate news value, are of great interest and importance to Catholics at home and abroad. Both to collect such apologetic articles and to distribute them at home and abroad, the Bureau of Publicity and Information was established and placed under the Executive Department. This Bureau sends out regularly articles and

items of interest to Catholic and secular journals, news agencies and individuals both in the United States and in foreign countries. Through this Bureau the facts of the Mexican religious persecution have reached the press of many lands.

Bureau of Historical Records. A review of the work of the National Catholic Welfare Conference would not be complete without reference to the work of the Bureau of Historical Records. The Bureau is a central depository of facts relating to the great part played by American Catholics in the War. Already records are filed of over 800,000 Catholics who gave their services to the nation. But again the successful completion of this work depends in large measure on the whole-hearted coöperation of Catholics throughout the country. The collection of this record has been wholly dependent on volunteer work by pastors, individual Catholics, and Catholic societies. Besides these specific records, invaluable data covering many fields of Catholic service to our country have been secured.

The Bulletin. The Conference publishes each month an official journal, the N. C. W. C. Bulletin, which gives not only an up-to-date record of the labors of the Conference, but contains timely and interesting articles on the many phases of Catholic activity in all parts of the country.

It is not possible even to summarize here the many important questions that have been the subject of decision and action by the N. C. W. C. since it began to function.

On many of these questions no successful action would have been possible except through a common representative organization such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Some of the matters held a vital, critical interest for every diocese in the country. Through the service of N. C. W. C. these matters were carried to a successful issue; and thus what no one diocese alone could do, was done by the united action of the dioceses, with consequent safeguarding of the interests of all.

We will cite here but two public questions of great and far-reaching importance that show how necessary it is for Catholics of the United States to be united and to have the means of coöperative counsel and action. These are the Oregon School

Case and the recurrent attempts to establish a federal Department of Education.

The Oregon School Law not only threatened the private, including the Catholic, schools of the State of Oregon, but jeopardized the existence and liberty of all Catholic schools in the United States. It made guilty of misdemeanor any parent who failed to send his child between the ages of eight and sixteen years to the public school. It was grounded on a philosophy of education which held that the child belonged first to the nation even before he belonged to his parents.

When the law was passed, the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in January 1923, recognizing the gravity of the situation, asked and received from the Bishops of the United States authorization to pledge to the late Archbishop Christie the support of the Bishops of the country in carrying the question of the constitutionality of such a law to the highest court of the United States. The entire conduct of the case was thereafter in the hands of the Administrative Committee, National Catholic Welfare Conference. It was their guidance and the far-reaching support given to them that resulted in the subsequent, epoch-making decision. Archbishop Christie formally accepted the offer of the Administrative Committee. The Committee arranged that Mr. William D. Guthrie of New York should act as chief counsel, supported by Mr. McEnerney of San Francisco, and Judge Kavanaugh of Portland, Oregon. In 1924, hearings on appeal were taken before the Federal Court for the District of Oregon and that court unanimously declared the law to be unconstitutional. The State of Oregon appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of the United States and in 1925 the Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, upheld the lower court and declared the law unconstitutional and void. In its decision the Supreme Court said: "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." State absolutism within the United States

was killed. The right of the parent to secure the religious education of his child was written into the organic law of the land.

The year 1914 marked the beginning in the United States of federal money grants for educational purposes. This meant a measure of control over education which the advocates of this policy endeavored year after year to extend. In 1917 they came out openly for a federal department of education with a secretary in the Cabinet. In every Congress since that time, this legislation has been reintroduced. Catholics have opposed and helped to defeat this attempt to monopolize and federalize education. At the public hearings on the Curtis-Reed Bill (by which title this legislation has been known in the past two Congresses) the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women have voiced the representative opinion of the Catholic organizations of the country. Many other organizations not Catholic; many experienced educators, Catholic and non-Catholic, joined in the protest; the studied and ably presented arguments have been effective.

The instruction of our fellow-citizens in the purpose and right of Catholic education must show no lessening of effort. The growing secularism of the day makes manifest the necessity of intelligent united work for the defence and promotion of our Catholic educational system and the contribution we can thus give to the spiritual life and well-being of the nation.

When the Mexican government put into effect its oppressive laws against religion, the Bishops of the United States, through the Administrative Committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, issued several public statements setting forth clearly the facts of the situation. From the first day that these iniquitous laws become operative, down to the present moment, the National Catholic Welfare Conference has been a principal agency, through its News Service, its Bureau of Publicity and through special pamphlets, to keep informed the people of the United States and of other countries, of the horrors of the persecution and the efforts of the Mexican Bishops for peace and justice. When the Bishops issued their Joint Pastoral in 1926, the National Catholic Welfare Conference was a distributing medium through which the pastoral reached every part of the civilized world.

The Administrative Committee made representations to the President of the United States protesting the persecution and asking him to do all in his power to bring about a solution of the problem. The National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women also made protestations to the President. By joint action both organized the National Committee for the Protection of Religious Rights in Mexico.

Every year the Administrative Committee sends its general, and its particular departmental reports, together with the minutes of the General Meeting of the Bishops, to the Papal Secretary of State, His Eminence, Cardinal Gasparri: to the Secretary of the Consistorial Congregation, His Eminence, Cardinal De Lai: to the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, His Eminence, Cardinal Sbarretti.

The following letter acknowledging these reports was received by the Chairman of the Administrative Committee:

ROME, 7 FEBRUARY, 1927.

Most Reverend Monsignor:

This Sacred Congregation of the Council takes pleasure in another opportunity to learn of the multiplied activities in the field of Catholic action covered by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, as detailed in the complete report of the Most Reverend President of the Administrative Committee for the year 1926, which report Your Grace has very courteously sent us.

I am particularly pleased with the timely interest shown by the Conference in its work for oppressed Mexico, in its having called the attention of the President of the United States to the real state of affairs in that Republic, thus correcting the false information spread by the press; in the reception and aid accorded to numerous ecclesiastics who were expelled; finally, in its generous financial assistance to the hierarchy of that country in their necessity.

To the many public expressions of gratitude toward the directors of the Conference for such a remarkable service, I am pleased to add my own praise and prayer for heavenly blessing.

Wishing your Grace every favor from the Lord and Saviour, and with respect, I remain

The most affectionate brother of Your Grace,

D. CARD. SBARRETTI, *Prefect.*

The Most Reverend EDWARD J. HANNA,
Archbishop of San Francisco.

As the N. C. W. C. is our united effort for the well-being of the Church in our own country and throughout the world, so our inspiration and guidance for all its work are our oneness with him who is the visible head of the Church, the Vicar on earth of our Lord Jesus Christ. Happily and gratefully we quote our Holy Father, Pius XI, who graciously addressed the following letter last year to the Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops of the United States:

Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers: Greeting and Apostolic Blessing:

Again and again, as occasion offered, We have congratulated you on your splendid zeal, for as much as you have continually rendered meritorious service to the Church both by the assiduous administration of your own dioceses, by generously coming to the aid of various peoples suffering from grave disaster, and finally by carrying to a happy issue undertakings of the greatest value to our holy Faith. Thus, quite recently We have learned with pleasure from Our Apostolic Delegate at Washington how zealously the organization known as the National Catholic Welfare Conference has hitherto striven to defend and, in every possible way, succor the Church in Mexico which has been so sorely tried. When the Mexican Bishops, in the first instance, appealed to you, citizens of a neighboring and most prosperous nation, for help and comfort, you hastened to provide both in generous measure. You not only gave the widest possible publicity to Our Encyclical "Iniquis Afflictisque" and upheld the Mexican Hierarchy in their public protest against iniquitous laws, but you yourselves issued a splendid statement wherein you made known to all Catholics and non-Catholics alike, the truth regarding the Mexican situation, thereby vigorously defending and furthering the cause of Holy Church. Surely everyone knows how effectually you have assisted Catholics of all classes from the neighboring Republic of Mexico, who left their native land to escape grievous persecution. When of late this persecution went to the extreme of banishing by force the Bishops themselves from their dioceses, it became forthwith your great concern both to harbor these Bishops as your own brothers and show them every mark of considerate kindness, thereby giving a striking example of that charity which everywhere is the essential characteristic of Christianity and the source of its vitality.

Hence appears with abundant evidence how timely and useful was the organization of the National Catholic Welfare Conference which you lately established, with its departments, the News Service,

and the Bureau of Immigration. This organization is not only useful, but also necessary for you. Since you reside in cities far apart and there are matters of a higher import demanding your joint deliberation—as, for example, those relating to the Christian family, the education of youth, public and private morality, care of numerous immigrants, and other problems of this kind—it is imperative that by taking counsel together you all agree on one common aim and with one united will strive for its attainment, by employing as you now do, the means which are adequate and adapted to present-day conditions.

Cease not, therefore, to labor in this spirit of unity for the welfare of our holy religion, in that great Republic where the Church, under God's providence, enjoys such wide freedom and such a high degree of prosperity. We, on Our part, have no doubt that by uniting ever more closely the forces at your command, you will impart to the Christian life in your country a greater and greater vigor in the spirit of justice and charity, to the end that the reign among you of the Lord Jesus, the Prince of true Peace, may be supreme and abound in every blessing: "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ."

Meanwhile, We bestow well deserved praise, first upon you who are so loyal to this Apostolic See, and then upon all those who in any way coöperate with you in this great work: and as We are informed that you are about to hold your Annual Meeting, We earnestly implore for you the light of Divine Wisdom; as an earnest of this heavenly gift and a token of Our own paternal good-will toward you, We impart most lovingly in the Lord the Apostolic blessing to you, Our Beloved Sons and Venerable Brothers, to all your clergy, and the faithful committed to the care of each.

PIUS PP. XI.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, 10 August, 1927,
in the sixth year of Our Pontificate.

AUSTIN DOWLING,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

THE SANCTITY OF SOEUR THERESE OF LISIEUX.

THE orthodox follower of Freud, if he considers the saints at all, places them in the category of mentally diseased persons. Thus Jung[1] interprets the Immaculate Conception in terms of the experience of a demented person suffering from a paranoid psychosis; in the same work the author (p. 97) suggests that St. Francis of Assisi and various mystics of the middle ages (p. 99), were victims of megalomania in the form of an organized system of delusions.[2]

In the present article it is proposed to prove that in the case of Sœur Thérèse this cannot be done. The discussion involves entering into the somewhat exhaustive catalogue of the categories of mental diseases and a comparison of them with the facts in the Saint's life story, in order to discover whether or not she can be included under their concepts.

The argument stated explicitly is as follows: Sœur Thérèse is either (a) a person of average attainments in religious ideals, (b) a mentally diseased person, or (c) a saint. Asserting, then, that she is not a person of average attainments in religious ideals and not a mentally diseased person, it follows that she can be only a person of superior achievement in religious ideals, i.e. a saint.

In other words, to the positive evidence that Sœur Thérèse is a saint, so obviously convincing to the Catholic mind, it is intended to add here the negative evidence, which the unbelieving mind requires, that she could not possibly be anything else.

I.

It is not probable that anyone acquainted with the life of Sœur Thérèse would ever say that in her attainment of religious ideals she was simply average. Of the many striking circumstances which emphasize this departure from the average is the fact that the Superior of the religious order of which

[1] *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 108.

[2] The basis of this viewpoint is the Freudian notion that the idea of God is a delusion projected from the individual's own consciousness, (Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 70, 71, 73). Consistently, Jung (*loc. cit.* p. 73), Freud, (quoted by Jung, *loc. cit.* p. 557), Moxon (*Psychoanalytic Review*, vol. viii, p. 98) regard Christ as a mentally diseased person; other writers said to hold similar views are Renan, Von Hartman, Nietzsche, Oscar Holtzman, Emil Rasmussen, de Loosten, C. Binet-Sangle (Land, *Psychoanalytic Review*, vol. ix, p. 105).

she was a member, not only was aware of the unusual character of Sœur Thérèse's attainments in religion, but was so conscious of the matter as to act on this conviction by not interfering with the duties of Sœur Thérèse even when the latter was in a state of critical illness, feeling that to do so might be counter to the designs of Providence which she felt to be the only explanation of the eminent superiority in virtue of Sœur Thérèse. The entrance into a religious order and faithfulness to the rule is in itself a remarkable attainment, but the recognition by a superior capable, by the necessity of her position, of judging in these matters indicates a preëminence in attainment.[3] The statement of Archbishop Bourne in the introduction to the Autobiography summarizes much: "Humility, self-effacement, obedience, hiddenness, unfaltering charity, with all the self-control and constant effort that they imply, are written on every page . . . ." There is no need to proceed further; only the slightest acquaintance with the contents of her autobiography is required to show that Sœur Thérèse exceeded the attainments not merely of the average person but even the attainments of those devoted to an austere religious life.

II.

In order to meet the alleged problem of mental disease in the case of Sœur Thérèse it will be necessary to give all the categories of this condition. The classification of mental diseases used here is that adopted as official by the American Psychiatric Association.[4] Each will be noted and discussed with reference to Sœur Thérèse.

1. *Traumatic psychosis.* This is a mental derangement due to violent injury to the brain, such as skull fracture. There is no record of any such injury in the entire life of Sœur Thérèse. The mental picture always involves confusion and memory disturbances; we are dealing here with unusual clarity of consciousness.

2. *Senile psychosis and psychosis with cerebral arteriosclerosis.* These are of course eliminated because they occur only in old age. Sœur Thérèse died at the age of twenty-five.

[3] *Sœur Thérèse of Lisieux,* An Autobiography, N. Y., J. P. Kenedy & Sons, 9th. edition, p. 199.

[4] Statistical Manual, for the Use of Hospitals for Mental Disease, 3rd. edition, The Nat. Com. for Mental Hygiene, 370 Seventh Avenue, New York City, 1923.

3. *General paralysis and psychosis with cerebral lues.* These conditions are due to a specific infection and produce definite physical disturbances, none of which appear in the life of Sœur Thérèse. These too involve mental confusion.

4. *Psychoses with brain tumor, chorea and other organic diseases of the brain.* All these are eliminated because they produce marked physical signs and mental deterioration. Throughout the whole story of Sœur Thérèse there is a steadily advancing mental development.

5. *Psychoses due to drugs of various kinds and alcohol.* These, of course, are mentioned merely for the sake of completeness. They produce unmistakable physical signs, none of which is present in our records. More specifically, they diminish volitional control, whereas in the case of Sœur Thérèse we see an increase of volitional control. They too involve mental confusion.

6. *Involutional melancholia.* This too, is mentioned simply for completeness. It occurs only in the latter years of middle life.

7. *Various forms of feeblemindedness.* The narrative of the autobiography indicates that Sœur Thérèse was a person of greater than average (superior) intelligence.

8. *Psychosis with epilepsy.* This is a characteristic disease which is simply mentioned also for completeness. It is associated with mental deterioration.

9. *Psychopathic personality.* This group gives a name to persons who are unable to develop any appreciation of moral values — the direct antithesis to the charity, humility, and unselfishness of Sœur Thérèse.

The above are so obvious that they need only to be mentioned. The following require a more extended discussion: manic depressive psychosis; dementia praecox (schizophrenia); psychosis with somatic disease, (in this instance, psychosis with pulmonary tuberculosis); paranoia and paranoid conditions; psychoneuroses, (a) hysteria, (b) psychasthenia, (c) neurasthenia.

10. *Manic Depressive Psychosis.* The characteristic mark of this condition is an extreme departure from emotional balance. This may be either exhilaration, with over-production of mental and physical activity, in which case, the condition is

"manic" in character; or, it may be depression, with retardation of mental and physical activity, in which case, the condition is depressive in character. In some instances there is depression with a certain amount of ideational and physical activity due to apprehension; these are the so-called "mixed" forms. In the classical form of this disease, the patient alternates between periods of exhilaration and periods of depression; these may be months or years in duration and, in the interval, years of normal emotional balance may be present. As the autobiography of Sœur Thérèse is traced from beginning to end, one finds no undue emotional shifts of any kind. There are indeed intense depths of feeling, but these are entirely appropriate to the situations which called them forth. There is no sign of a personality given to moods, such as is involved in this disease. There is the one clear aim, manifested in childhood and carried through with utmost consistency until death. There is no flightiness at any time; no feeling that is not adequately explained by mental or physical events. Perhaps of all factors the consistency of years in the plan of pursuing an ideal is the most important in putting this type of disorder out of the question.

11. *Dementia Praecox.* In dementia praecox or schizophrenia (*splitting of the mind*) the outstanding marks are an emotional apathy and a retirement into a world of fantasy, which, as the disease progresses, takes the place of the real world. The dream world becomes more and more vivid and phantasms become hallucinations; voices are heard, visions are seen, strange odors and tastes are perceived, and unusual sensations are experienced, none of which has any basis in reality. To speak of emotional apathy in the case of Sœur Thérèse is utter absurdity. She felt deeply; witness such an event as this:[5] "'My God,' she cried on the day of her religious profession, 'give me martyrdom of soul or body . . . or rather give me both the one and the other!'" And the subsequent suffering of soul and body is written through her story to the end. It simplifies our task greatly to point out that throughout the whole life of Sœur Thérèse there were no voices heard, no visions seen, and no other sensations of an unusual character perceived. The problem of distinguishing between hallucina-

[5] *Autobiography*, p. 193, Epilogue.

tions and mystical experiences does not arise. This cannot be too strongly emphasized, for in the unbelieving mind, immediately on hearing voices or seeing visions the individual is catalogued as mentally diseased. Nor is there any retirement into an unreal world of phantasms. There is on the contrary the deepest charity manifested toward all her associates, the greatest kindness and consideration shown to all, indicating a flowing out of emotional responses to others in really an unusual degree.

12. *Psychosis with Somatic Disease.* Under the group of "psychosis with somatic disease" it is necessary to consider (a) a psychosis based on physical exhaustion, and (b) a psychosis associated with pulmonary tuberculosis. In general this group represents the various forms of delirium occurring with sickness of all kinds, including the delirium of typhoid fever, pneumonia and the confused mental states of heart and kidney disease, etc. It is an important category inasmuch as extreme physical exhaustion may result from various ascetic practices, and inasmuch as it is undoubtedly true that the cause of Sœur Thérèse's death was pulmonary tuberculosis. In these conditions we have the following characteristics: there is delirium of some sort; where the exhaustion (usually produced by lack of sleep associated with severe emotional excitement), is the causative factor, there are usually hallucinations; where the factor is an infectious agent, the delirious experiences are either very dimly perceived in consciousness, or are spoken words without consciousness. Because the brain is directly affected either by the toxin of fatigue or that of infection, there is associated with the disease a certain dimness and haziness of consciousness usually present to such a degree that it amounts to definite mental confusion.

It has been pointed out that there were no unusual sensory experiences which would suggest delirium or hallucinations in the life of Sœur Thérèse. There is no mental confusion. As one reads her autobiography, one finds the most vivid and clear awareness of things. Moreover, in her case we are not at any time dealing with the detached events of a bodily illness but with the consistent and successful attempts of a lifetime devoted to the achievement of the most rigorous and difficult of ideals. Even when her illness was at its height, there were

clear consciousness and persistence in the pursuit of her aim. Her own words are as follows: "I could not obtain permission to remain watching at the Altar of Repose throughout Thursday night, and I returned to our cell at midnight. Scarcely was my head laid on the pillow when I felt a hot stream rise to my lips. I thought I was going to die, and my heart nearly broke with joy. But as I had already put out our lamp, I mortified my curiosity until the morning and slept in peace. At five o'clock when it was time to get up, I remembered at once that I had some good news to learn, and going to the window I found, as I had expected, that our handkerchief was soaked with blood." She had had a pulmonary hemorrhage and realized that death was not far away. These are words of a clear-thinking individual; no cloudiness of mental vision is there. And yet no one would maintain that the average human being would be capable of peaceful sleep after such an event, or of such extreme joy over the approach of death.

13. *Paranoia.* Paranoia or paranoid conditions are described [6] as follows: "The group comprises cases which show clinical fixed suspicions, persecutory delusions, dominant ideas or grandiose trends logically elaborated and with due regard for reality after once a false interpretation or premise has been accepted. Further characteristics are formally correct conduct, adequate emotional reactions, clearness and coherence of the train of thought." The fundamental delusions of the paranoid state are two: delusions of persecution and delusions of grandeur; the two are dependent upon one another. In every case of paranoia there is *an exalted feeling of self.* The usual story of the development is as follows: a young man or woman sets out to achieve something worth while; because of intellectual or volitional incapacity, failure results; then, instead of looking within and discovering his or her own weakness, the environment is blamed, and a delusion of persecution is formed. To be the object of persecution suggests greater self-importance, which leads to delusions of grandeur, and the ambitions unachieved in reality are fulfilled in fantasy.

As we sum up the problem we find that the abnormality rereduces itself to an exaggerated self-importance. If we use a word which is not used in psychiatric literature, because of

[6] *Stat. Manual,* p. 30.

its moral connotation, we would say that the dominating factor in this condition is *pride*. There are those who dismiss all discussions of the saints by referring to them as paranoiacs. But the matter is not so easily settled. In Sœur Thérèse there is opposed to the self-importance of this mental condition, the purest type of humility. There is no reaction to failure; she was quietly conscious to the end of having lived according to her religious rule; there was success.

The contrast between any kind of self-exaltation and Sœur Thérèse's humility is vividly marked. Consider a girl whose childhood was ideal, renouncing marriage, wealth, and her own will and living successfully up to these vows. The self-effacement of Sœur Thérèse is summed up in the epithet by which she is generally known . . . "The Little Flower". The very littleness of the deeds of Sœur Thérèse illustrates this. To take one example of very many: "A small jar, left behind a window, was found broken. No one knew who put it there, but our Mistress was displeased, and thinking I was to blame in leaving it about, told me I was very untidy and must be more careful in the future. Without answering I kissed the ground and promised to be more observant." Her own comment on this incident follows and indicates that as her life advanced she did not allow herself even the consolation of a future justice: "I was so little advanced in virtue that these small sacrifices cost me dear, and I had to console myself with the thought that at the day of Judgment all would be known."[7]

14. *Psychoneuroses.* The psychoneuroses really need not be considered here as they do not involve any essential change in the individual mental make-up, or any substantial departure from normality. They represent in general "nervous" people. There are no delusions, no hallucinations; depression and elation, when they occur, are adequate to the situations which evoke them; there are no disturbances of memory. There are three groups: hysteria, psychasthenia, and neurasthenia.

In hysteria, a bodily symptom results, from a mental conflict, or desires not fully conscious, such as the loss of voice occurring as a result of stage-fright, and paralyses of various parts of the body when a fight is to be avoided or compensation

[7] *Autobiography*, p. 117.

to be gained. In the whole history of Sœur Thérèse nothing suggestive of hysterical phenomena occurs.

In psychasthenia there are anxieties, morbid fears, doubts, obsessive ideas, and impulses. Various degrees of psychasthenia may be expected in all sensitive natures and could not be regarded as a grave departure from normality. In Sœur Thérèse however we have a confident faith, a calm hopefulness, persistent efforts toward goals without impulsive conduct. Everywhere a mental and emotional stability marks her progress toward the ideals she set for herself.

In neurasthenia we have the fatigue states of the nervous system, characterized by hyper-irritability, tendency to be easily tired out by slight physical and mental effort. Usually as a result of this, there is heightened responsiveness of the nervous system, characterized by awareness of functions of the body which are normally not conscious, such as awareness of the heart beat, perception of the movement of the stomach and similar things which awaken ideas and fears that there is heart trouble or stomach trouble. This too is an illness which occurs in people very generally as the result of over-work, over-excitement, and after acute disease, operations, accidents, and other types of bodily disease and injuries. It does not involve any essential abnormality. In Sœur Thérèse, in spite of the physical exhaustion and the wasting disease which she must have had for several years, we find such unusual stolidity that all her feelings of fatigue and all her pain are borne without complaint. In spite of the fact that a basis for this illness was present to an exaggerated degree, we see no signs of its development.

III.

This paper has dealt with this issue: If Sœur Thérèse is not a saint, what is she? For it is evident that she was a most extraordinary person. This question has been answered, at the risk of tediousness, by listing all the known possibilities of abnormality and showing that they do not apply. We require then a new category; to the normal and abnormal person we must add the hypernormal. To the two we are compelled to add the category of sanctity.

It seems fortunate, indeed, in this age when the most sacred things are subjected to coldest analysis, that an example of

sanctity in a pure form should be had amongst us. So unalloyed with any abnormality is this quality in Sœur Thérèse that it may be verified by any one who will read her autobiography, or, if the verification be incomplete, check against any group of abnormalities that has been suggested. From it all will emerge the pure sanctity of this girl as a crystal emerges complete and perfect from the contaminations of the liquid in which it is dissolved. The transparent and perfectly formed crystal becomes more beautiful by contrast with the muddy liquor which surrounds it. The character of Sœur Thérèse emerges more gloriously holy from the contrasts with those abnormalities which are so frequently used to explain the unusual personalities of the saints.

In brief, charity, humility and chastity, which sum up the character of Sœur Thérèse, are the notes of a state completely different from any we have considered; completely different, too, from the attainments of average human personality; and hence necessitating another category which can only be called sanctity.

ALPHONSE R. VONDERAHE.

Medical College,
University of Cincinnati.

ST. PAUL'S HYMN OF LOVE.
(I Cor. 13.)

"WHAT streams of wisdom," exclaims St. John Chrysostom, "flow from even one short sentence of St. Paul! What a wealth of that heavenly wisdom which is beyond words flows from just one phrase of his! Indeed, Paul's letters are both mines and wells: mines, because they provide riches more precious than gold; wells, because they never fail —the more you draw upon them, the more they give out." If this figure of the great Patriarch of Constantinople is applicable to the Pauline Epistles in general, it is particularly appropriate when describing the Apostle's celebrated panegyric of charity contained in the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. For almost two thousand years commentators and interpreters have been striving to penetrate to the depths of this marvellous mine, but even now they have

hardly succeeded in boring beneath the surface, so hidden, so precious, so divine are the treasures secreted there under the dross of human language. "One would say," observes Toussaint, "that an inspiration from on high borrows for a moment the language of angels. Never has human voice found such words to describe what is most divine here below. Never has the prophetic spirit been elevated to such heights. This is not a narrative, but a hymn, a song, a cry of enthusiasm." Chrysostom characterizes this particular passage as a picture of matchless beauty and exhorts his hearers to examine each of the Apostle's sayings that they may know both the treasure which is in the divine virtue thus sublimely described and the art of the painter who has left us this exquisite image of it. In fulfillment, then, of this admonition of him who was perhaps the world's greatest admirer of the Apostle of the Gentiles, we shall try to form some appreciation of the spiritual masterpiece which he has bequeathed to us, not by considering his every phrase, as Chysostom suggests, but by a more general glance at its main outlines.

To appreciate the full meaning of St. Paul's heavenly message we must consider, in the first place, the time to which this great hymn of love belongs. "It was in the spring-morning of the Church," writes Sauter, "when the Apostle's clear-ringing voice resounded to the men of Corinth, to the young Church, to the whole world. Paganism was sunk in darkness; Judaism had come to an end. The philosophy, the knowledge, the wonders of the human intellect which paganism had produced had availed nothing for the happiness of mankind; the faith, the law, and the ceremonial of Israel, with all their excellence, had brought men only to the threshold of happiness. The pagan ideal was Hedonism, a life of pleasure, earthly happiness and the gratification of nature; everything must minister to this ideal: nature, knowledge, art, philosophy, religion itself. The result of this was, not the happiness of mankind, but increasing darkness of spirit, continually growing coldness of heart, and ever more profound dissatisfaction throughout human society. Judaism was certainly in possession of the truth and of the knowledge of the true God; it walked, nevertheless, along the road of preparation and cleansing; it was under the law of servitude, and its life was the

hard and severe service of law and ceremonial. — Now the fulness of time was come. The Sun of Justice had risen; over the darkness of paganism and the twilight of Judaism suddenly streamed the sunshine of Christianity; the natural law of paganism, the Jewish law of servitude . . . were more clearly manifested in the Christian law, . . . the law of charity. And as with the sunrise all creation revives and is, as it were, transfigured, . . . so the darkness of paganism sank down, the twilight of Judaism grew pale, the shadows vanished, light and warmth were poured into human hearts, filling all the world with a new, supernatural, divine life, . . . as the law of charity shone forth in heaven."

Equally necessary for a thorough understanding of this celebrated passage is a clear concept of its place in the Epistle of which it forms so important a part. This chapter is not, as some modern commentators suggest, a digression from the general content of the Letter; rather it forms an intimate and logical division of Paul's first communication to the Corinthian Church. Very great and very special gifts had been bestowed upon the converts of the prosperous Greek city. They, however, instead of humbly thanking God for these extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Spirit and instead of using them for the benefit of their brethren, made the Divine favors the subject of the most acrimonious disputes and esteemed most highly the gifts that attracted most attention to their possessors, such as tongues and prophecy. As a result of their erroneous judgments pride and envy were rampant in the Church of Corinth. Those of the faithful who possessed the more brilliant charismata gloried in them, while the others, not content with favors less splendid, were jealous of their more fortunate brethren. Paul wished to correct their mistaken notions of the values of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Exhorting the Corinthians by means of the allegory of the human body, he points out to them that all were members of the Mystical Body of Christ and that every gift of God was intended for the harmony, beauty, and perfection of the entire Body. The faithful, therefore, should be satisfied with the favors which the Spirit "divides as He will" and instead of disputing whether their individual charismata were great or small, they should rather strive after those gifts which would be of service

to their own souls (V. 12). Then, before treating in detail of the two charismata which were held in such exaggerated esteem (V. 14), the Apostle indicates "the more excellent way," the way of charity. Verse thirteen, therefore, fits in intimately and logically in Paul's treatment of the gifts of the Spirit.

Now arises the very important question, what in the mind of the Apostle is charity? Older commentators, such as Chrysostom, seem to restrict charity to the virtue by which we love our neighbor. All modern interpreters, however, agree that Paul speaks of the theological virtue by which we love God for Himself and our neighbor for the love of God; that charity, in other words, which is either the same as sanctifying grace or inseparably connected with it and which is poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5). That both habitual and actual charity are included is evident from the fact that acts of the virtue as well as the motive are spoken of. Paul compares "the more excellent way" with the various gifts of the Holy Ghost in order that it may be made clear that this divine virtue of itself leads man to life eternal and that the charismata, if had without charity, cannot help man to attain salvation.

Since it is our intention to study this admirable treatise in the setting given it by its inspired author, namely, as an integral part of his treatment of the charismata, we shall divide the chapter thus:

1. what the charismata avail without charity; its indispensable necessity (1-3);

2. what charity avails of itself though the charismata be lacking; the utility of charity since it prompts us to practise all other virtues (4-7);

3. charity by its eternal duration surpasses all charismata (8-13).

In verses 1-3 then, Paul compares charity with the charismata and teaches that the possession of even the highest gifts is of no avail unless love be present. His meaning is that a man who is in the state of sin, and hence without charity, can acquire no merit for life eternal. Like any other good works done by a sinner they dispose one for justification, but this disposition is vain unless charity follows. The Apostle begins

with the gift of tongues because, being the most brilliant of all the divine favors, it was so highly esteemed by the Corinthians. His demonstration of the utter inutility of the charismata when possessed without charity may be paraphrased as follows: "Even though I were to speak all the languages spoken by all men, even though I could perceive and repeat the mysterious and exquisite phrases in which the angels sing the glories of their Creator, — if I had not charity my voice would sound like the screeching trumphet that sends forth an unmeaning noise or the tinkling cymbal which, while emitting a pleasing sound for others, wears itself away in the process. Nay more, suppose me to possess the more perfect gifts of prophecy, wisdom, knowledge and miraculous faith; suppose me to possess them in their highest degree, so that I could read the depths of every heart, raise the veil of the future, understand the deeper mysteries of faith, the hidden ways of God and His mysterious counsels; suppose that I could explain all these things in a clear and convincing manner to others; suppose that by a special illumination of the Holy Ghost I should be blessed with such great confidence in God, that I should readily believe that He would, if necessary, manifest His omnipotence by moving mountains — if I possessed all these extraordinary gifts and were without charity, I should be as nothing in the sight of heaven."

Thus far Paul has been comparing charity with those charismata which were most admirable and esteemed by the Corinthians. Now (verse 3) he passes to those special graces which, though they excited less admiration, rendered a man suitable for helping his neighbor in ordinary daily life and which were, consequently, more similar to true virtues. In the following equivalent terms he thus concludes his comparison: "If I should break food into small pieces and with my own hands put it into the mouths of the poor, if I were to go on doing this until all my goods should be spent, I should derive no profit for eternity unless my actions were informed by charity. And even though I should undergo for my neighbor the most terrible of all deaths, that of being burned alive, — however noble might be the natural motive for my sacrifice — if I have not charity, even such an heroic deed profiteth me nothing for the life to come." How the proud Corinthians

who boasted of the possession of the various charismata and who looked with disdain upon their less fortunate brethren must have bowed their heads in shame, in compunction and in humility before this fearful revelation of their nothingness in the sight of God.

Having shown, therefore, that the greatest gifts of the Spirit, whether destined for working wonders or for promoting the temporal and spiritual good of the neighbor, afford no utility if they be separated from charity, the Apostle proceeds to indicate what the divine virtue avails of itself, even though the charismata be lacking (4-7). But because the love of God and the love of neighbor are so intimately connected that the one is not found without the other, and because men can more easily deceive themselves regarding their love of God, Paul enumerates the qualities of charity toward one's neighbor. Hence in this section charity is described, "not only as indwelling, but as operative by the aid of actual grace".[1] "The Apostle says in these verses", explains Chrysostom, "that the love we are speaking of is the mother of all good things. For just as where there are garments and sandals of gold we require also some other mark to distinguish a king; but if we see purple and a royal diadem we require no other sign of royalty, so when the diadem of love is on our head it is enough to point out the genuine disciple of Christ." In all, thirteen characteristics are mentioned, five positive and eight negative. Charity is personified so that the qualities of one possessing it are attributed to the virtue itself.

"Charity", continues our paraphrase, "bears long and patiently injuries received from others, dictates that we flee all desire of revenge, endures all the faults and defects of our neighbor." "Note well," comments Paul's golden-mouthed interpreter, "that the Apostle puts first as the cause of the excellence of charity, patience, the root of all self-denial. As a spark falling on the ocean does no injury and is easily extinguished, so whatever falls upon a patient soul speedily vanishes, but the soul it disturbs not. The patient soul is always settled as in a harbor and endures a profound calm." "But charity," we continue with St. Paul, "not only endures nobly, but soothing and comforting it heals the wounds of

[1] Rickaby.

souls. It is kind; it would communicate to others all that it has; it is affable, obliging, free from moroseness and disposes us to serve all. And withal, it is not inflated with vanity and pride, despising those who have received fewer favors from God." "There may be those," observes Chrysostom, "who think highly of themselves because they are patient and kind, because they are not grudging, envious or mean. But charity perfectly purges out all. It supplies a medicine to patience, kindness, and keeps the virtue of patience pure. Again, the kind person will often become over-complaisant, but this charity corrects, for she is not puffed up. Seest thou, then, how Paul adorns charity not only from what she has, but also from what she has not; for she both nourishes virtue and extirpates vice; rather she suffers not vice to spring up at all. But why," proceeds the Patriarch, "why do I say she is not puffed up when she is so far from inflation with pride that in suffering even the very worst for him whom she loves, she does not count even that as unworthy of her. And so when Christ our Lord was spat upon and beaten, not only did He not think His plight a sorry one, but He gloried and exulted in it." And if we were to seek the reason why charity is not ambitious, Chysostom again would tell us that it is because she seeketh not her own, that is, her own selfish ends to the detriment or disregard of the good of others. Just as one who has his gold buried in the house of another, should he refuse to go there and dig it up, will never see it: so he that will not seek his own profit in the advantage of his neighbor will not attain unto the crown due him.

"Charity is not provoked to anger." It is not prone to revenge or passionate excitement because of injuries received; it not only subdues vice but does not suffer it to take any ground at all. Paul does not say, "Though provoked to anger it overcomes", but "It is not even provoked". Charity "thinketh no evil"; it takes no account of the injuries inflicted by others, but generously pardons all evils because it regards them as not proceeding from a bad intention. The comment of Chrysostom is again worth quoting: "Paul does not say, 'worketh no evil' but 'thinketh no evil'. Far from contriving evil itself, charity does not suspect it of the beloved." Charity "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with

the truth"—does not rejoice at the sins of others, but is pleased at the good that is done by them, at the virtue that appears in them. "Seest thou", asks Chrysostom, "how by degrees charity makes of her possessor an angel? For when he is void of anger, free from envy, liberated from every tyrannical passion, he hath arrived at the very serenity of the angels."

But this divine virtue is not content with not rejoicing at the injustices committed by others. In addition she covers and conceals all the defects, faults and vices of the neighbor. Her possessor is always disposed to judge favorably of his brother, believes all manner of good of him, hopes always for the better, endures all kinds of insult and injury to bring his neighbor to God. The charitable soul excludes all feelings of distrust when this can be prudently done; believeth always from the very excess of love, despairs not of the loved one, and if he turn not out according to hope, endureth this also.

Not content with this glorious praise of charity as the soul of all virtue, Paul now brings forth the most divine of all her attributes, her eternal perpetuity (8-13). The charismata because of their essential imperfection will perish, but charity will endure forever. Even the theological virtues of faith and hope must give way to vision and fruition; charity alone abides in the life to come. And not only will those charismata cease which the Corinthians held in such exaggerated esteem, but the very greatest gifts and together with them all inferior manifestations of the Spirit, will be destroyed. But this perennity of the divine virtue must not be understood in the sense that it cannot be lost in this life through mortal sin. Such an interpretation is excluded both by other passages of Holy Writ and by Paul's intention. The Apostle does not speak of the cessation of the charismata on account of sin, but teaches that they will perish because of their inherent imperfection and their unsuitableness to any but an imperfect state. That this intrinsic imperfection of the charismata is the basis of his argument for their destruction is clear from verses 9 and 10, for passing over the minor gifts he explains that even knowledge and prophecy will disappear with the advent of a more perfect state. That all our knowledge in this life, including that which is a "gratia gratis data", is imperfect is evident.

This gift of the Spirit even in its widest sense is based upon and depends upon faith; but faith compared with the intuitive vision of God is imperfect because it neither apprehends all truth nor does it fully understand the dogmas that have been revealed. Indeed, whatever we have of heavenly mysteries in this life, though certain as resting on the authority of God, participates in the obscurity of faith. Hence the knowledge which we now possess, being only mediate and obscure and specifically different from the immediate, clear and perfect knowledge concomitant with the intuitive vision of God, shall be destroyed. The gift of prophecy is had only in part because the prophet reveals only those truths which are here and now suggested by the Holy Ghost for the utility of his hearers, and because everything that he communicates is based on faith, referred to faith and therefore obscure. But when faith will have given way to the beatific vision, when we shall have been elevated by the light of glory to understand the First Truth and in It all truth, those gifts which refer to this theological virtue or are based on it shall be destroyed.

The question naturally arises, is not the charity of this life imperfect? Why then does not it too cease in the life to come? "To remove the imperfection of the other gifts," responds MacEvilly, "so as to render them suitable for the life to come, they must altogether change their species, for the obscurity of the knowledge conveyed by these several gifts is founded on the obscurity of faith of which they are the instruments. When, therefore, the obscurity of faith shall have been exchanged for the clearness of vision, these gifts will no longer be useful and will cease with the end which they subserved. But charity, though intensified and rendered perfect in the future life, will still be specifically the same." As a further reason for the specific identity of the two charities we may add with Cornely that the formal object of charity, the Goodness of God, is the same both here and hereafter. Therefore only in degree and intensity does the charity of this life differ from that of the life to come.

The Apostle now illustrates by two figures the argument contained in verses 9 and 10. "If childhood," we may paraphrase, "in its manner of speaking, of thinking, of knowing be compared with manhood, a child has obscure and imperfect

knowledge similar to that which is had through the gifts of knowledge and prophecy, if these charismata be compared with the clear and distinct knowledge of the blessed. Hence, after attaining to the full and perfect knowledge of heaven I shall no longer need the gifts which are so useful here below. Now indeed, in this life, I see God and the things of God dimly, through the medium of creatures and revelation. 'Many puzzles, riddles and perplexities wait upon faith.'[2] But then, in heaven, I shall see God face to face, and in Him all the mysteries of faith clearly and distinctly. Now I know only in part, imperfectly; then I shall fully and intuitively know divine truth even as I am known from all eternity by God. Not that my knowledge of God will be equal to His understanding of me, but only that it will be similar, that is, direct and perfect in its kind."

"But that blessed state," we continue with St. Paul, "has not yet come. This perfect knowledge awaits us only in the future life. In our present state of existence, in which all cannot possess the various charismata, there remain the virtues of faith, hope and charity, virtues which are at all times absolutely necessary for the just if they would enter unto life eternal. The gifts of the Spirit are conferred according to the needs of the Church, and since there will come a time when they will not be necessary for the Kingdom of God on earth, they will pass away. But faith, hope and charity must remain unto the end of the world. Then, when faith will have passed into vision and hope into fruition, there will remain for all eternity only charity."

Truly, then, is charity "the greatest of these"; greater than the most extraordinary charismata of the Church's infancy, because these graces, serving as they did only a passing need, have already disappeared before the calm strength of her later maturity; greater than faith and hope, because these virtues, though required in all who would conquer under the banner of the Church Militant, have no place in the Church Triumphant, in which all that which is in part is done away. But charity, absolutely indispensable in this life, takes on her true perfection only when the obscurity of faith and the longings of hope are absorbed in the glorious and divine light of the Face of the Eternal.

[2] Rickaby.

Appropriately, therefore, does the Apostle exhort the Corinthians to follow after charity, to pursue her with the same zest with which game is pursued in the chase, to strive with might and main to gain possession of her. Chrysostom, himself raised to almost inspired heights by the contemplation of Paul's masterful picture, thus meditates upon the heavenly message of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "If this divine virtue were everywhere in abundance, what wonderful benefits would ensue. There would be no need then of laws, of tribunals, of punishments since, if all men loved and were loved, no man would injure another. Murders, strifes, wars and vice would be unknown even by name. Consider, too, how great a blessing it is of itself to exercise charity, what cheerfulness it produces, in how great grace it establishes the soul. Other virtues have each their trouble yoked to them, but love along with the gain hath pleasures and no trouble, and like an industrious bee gathers the sweets from every flower and deposits them in the soul of him who loveth. Love changeth the nature of things; she makes virtue pleasant and difficulties easy to overcome; she presents herself with all blessings in her hands, more gentle than any mother, more wealthy than any queen. Let us then with all diligence implant her in our souls, that she may produce for us many blessings and that we may have her fruit ever abounding, that fruit which is ever fresh and never decays." St. Augustine in his characteristic style thus summarizes Paul's inspired hymn: "Caritas inchoata, inchoata justitia est; caritas provecta, provecta justitia est; caritas magna, magna justitia est; caritas perfecta, perfecta justitia est."

EMMET P. O'CONNELL, S.J.

St. Louis, Missouri.

THE THEOLOGY OF A DOLLAR BILL.

THE young man who sold his books on the day before his ordination would probably define a stipend as a five-dollar bill that is given for a Mass. A canonist might describe a stipend as the money which is offered to a priest who in turn agrees to say a Mass and apply its special fruit according to the intention of the giver. But every priest worthy of the name sees in these offerings something more than a greenback or a gold-piece. To one who is an "alter Christus", Mass

stipends are an epitome of Sacred Scripture, a conspectus of ecclesiastical history, and a compendium of theology.

The longer a priest reads his Bible and talks with his people and prays to his God, the more inclined will he become to look upon a Mass stipend as a sacred thing, like the lamb which was consecrated to God by being offered on the altar of Jehovah. For anyone familiar with the history of Mass stipends readily perceives that they are analogous to the gifts which the Israelites made to their priests; and that, like many other institutions in the New Testament, the primitive oblations and subsequent stipends of the Christians had their adumbration in the religious customs of the ancient Hebrews.

The very first book of Holy Writ tells us that long before the positive divine law was codified, men living in the patristic age had been impelled by an innate sense of propriety to bestow gifts on priests as the vice-gerents of the Lord. Thus we read[1] that Abraham gave tithes of all his possessions to Melchisedech, the priest who had offered a sacrifice for him. Later, Moses, acting of course under divine guidance but influenced also by his knowledge of the Egyptian caste system, set apart the tribe of Aaron as a priestly race, an intellectual aristocracy. To this distinguished class, Moses assigned a munificent income. He decreed in substance that the income of the average priest or levite should be fifty times as great as the earnings of an ordinary man.[2]

In addition to this salary, the members of the priestly caste received certain "stole fees". The ransom of the first-born and the offerings that were made in fulfillment of a vow belonged entirely to the priests. "Whatsoever is first-born of all flesh, which they offer to the Lord, whether it be of men or of beasts, shall belong to thee: only for the first-born of man thou shalt take a price, and every beast that is unclean thou shalt cause to be redeemed." "Everything that the children of Israel shall give by vow, shall be thine".[3]

Finally, the descendants of Aaron had a source of income that was analogous to the Mass stipends of the Catholic priest; namely, the offerings that were made on the occasion of the

[1] Genesis, 14:20.

[2] Cf. Link, *Mess-stipendien,* Regensburg, 1901, p. 4.

[3] Num., 18:14; cf. Num., 18:18.

manifold sacrifices that were prescribed by the Mosiac Law. To the priests belonged, for instance, the sin-offerings. "As the sacrifice for sin is offered, so is also that for a trespass: the same shall be the law of both these sacrifices: it shall belong to the priest that offereth it."[4] Of other holocausts, the priests and levites received at least a portion. "The breast also and the shoulder that is separated, you shall eat in a most clean place, thou and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee. For they are set aside for thee and thy children, of the victims of peace-offerings of the children of Israel."[5] Although offerings in thanksgiving for favors received were offered by the people themselves, nevertheless a portion of the victim was sent to the priests. "The servant of the priest came and said to the man that sacrificed: 'Give me flesh to boil for the priest'."[6] In fact every animal that was slain in the desert had to be offered as a sacrifice and a portion of it given to the priests.[7]

Thus the descendants of Aaron lived by the altar. It was precisely in the very act of worship that the priests and levites of the old law received a notable part of their sustenance. This principle, that he who serves the altar should also live by the altar, was observed by the Israelites for centuries and was accepted by them as a self-evident obligation. St. Paul used this positive divine law of the old testament as an argument for a similar way of supporting the ministers of the altar in the new dispensation. In his first Epistle to the Corinthians, he evidently took it for granted that the Christians knew about this Mosiac precept; for he asks rhetorically, "Know you not that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar, partake with the altar?"[8]

In his day, the Christians presented the eucharistic elements of bread and wine for the sacrifice of the Mass just as they had brought the lamb for the Jewish sacrifice. Later, they offered not only bread and wine but also other food-stuffs and even

[4] Lev., 7:7.
[5] Lev., 10:14.
[6] I Kings, 2:15.
[7] Cf. Lev., 17:1-9.
[8] I Cor., 9:13.

money at the Agapé or love-feast. These gifts were no longer intended primarily for Consecration or Communion; and they were presented, not at the altar during Mass, but outside of the holy sacrifice. But even from the earliest times, the presentation of these eucharistic elements by the faithful was omitted in Masses for the dead because the mourners did not receive Holy Communion at such Masses. Hence money, instead of bread and wine, was offered occasionally at Masses for the dead. From these general pecuniary offerings, it was not a far cry to the Mass stipends in the strict sense of the term. Mass stipends in their modern form differ from all other offerings in these three respects: stipends are given, morally speaking, by an individual person to an individual priest; the donor gets an exclusive right in justice to the special fruit of the Mass; and the giver of the stipend need not be present at the Mass.[9] It seems to be an historical fact that Mass stipends in the strict sense of the word existed before the eighth century; but beyond this, little can be said with certainty.[10]

Tertullian (born 160 A. D.) used such expressions as, "You make yearly offerings, you offer for two wives, will your sacrifice ascend?" These last words, "your sacrifice" seems to mean that the man in question had made the priest's Mass his own sacrifice by requesting its celebration and excluding others as far as possible from the application of its special fruit.[11] Origen (185-254) mentioned offerings which consisted of victuals and money.[12] Venerable Bede recorded the fact that in the seventh century people used to have Masses said by priests to whom they gave money.[13] The Rule of Chrodegang permitted individual priests in the eighth century to accept an "alms" for the application of Masses.[14] In the ninth century, Strabo questioned the power of a priest to apply the special fruit of a Mass to an individual; and thus he undermined the whole doctrine about stipends.[15] St. Matilda in the tenth

[9] Cf. Binterim, *Denkwuerdigkeiten,* Mainz, 1828, Vol. IV, part 3, pp. 370-378.

[10] Cf. Geier, *De Missarum Stipendiis,* Moguntiae, 1864, p. 22. But Geier himself believed that stipends could be traced back to the fourth century.

[11] Tertullian, *De Exhortatione Castitatis,* cap. XI, M.P.L., 11, 926; cf. 942.

[12] Origen, *In Numeros,* Homilia XI, n. 9; M.P.G., XII, 655.

[13] Cf. Bede, *Historia Anglorum,* lib. IV, c. 22; M.P.L., XCV, 205-207.

[14] Cf. *Chrodegangi Regula Canonicorum,* c. XLII; M.P.L., LXXXIX, 1076.

[15] Cf. Walafrid Strabo, *De Rebus Eccl.,* cap. 22; M.P.L., CXIV, 951.

century told a priest naively, "Take this gold and sing a Mass of Requiem." [16] The legend about St. Peter Damian, who lived in the eleventh century, is known to every priest.[17] The sad story of the "Missa Sicca" and the "Missa Bifaciata" in the twelfth century were better left untold.[18]

On this Scriptural basis and with this historical background, it is possible to build up a correct concept of stipends. But to do so is not as easy as it would at first appear. The hardest terms for a lexicographer to define are the words that people use most frequently. The most profound mysteries for a theologian to explain are the ones that pertain to his daily Mass. And the hardest financial problem for the average pastor to solve is to tell his flock the real reason why a priest accepts a dollar for saying a Mass. Of reasons, however, there is no dearth. St. Thomas Aquinas taught that a stipend is offered and accepted for the priest's sustenance.[19] Scotus considered Mass stipends a reciprocity of gratuitous donations.[20] Bonacina taught that the giver of a stipend becomes the employer of the priest, who, like a hireling, reads the Mass.[21] Mostazo contended that the people who give a stipend thereby compensate the priest for the "lucrum cessans" suffered by him because he cannot engage in other lucrative pursuits whilst he is saying Mass.[22] Laymann's explanation is founded on the principle that one good turn deserves another.[23] Del Giudice maintains that stipends constitute a mandate or unilateral contract.[24]

The most satisfactory explanation of the nature of Mass stipends is the theory which was proposed by Suarez and espoused by Cardinal Gasparri.[25] According to this theory,

[16] Apud Berlendi, *Delle Oblazioni,* Venice 1736, p. 230.

[17] Cf. Second Nocturn for feast of St. Peter Damian, 23 Feb., lesson IV.

[18] Cf. Benedict XIV, "Inst." LVI, n. 11.

[19] *Summa Theol.,* 2-2, q. 100, art. 2 ad 2.

[20] Scotus, *Quaestiones Quodlibetales,* Quaest. XX, n. 25. apud Opera Omnia, Parisiis, 1895, Vol. 26, p. 324.

[21] "Qui negotia alterius gerit potest sustentationem ab eo exigere." *Tract. de Sacramentis,* Disputatio IV. apud Opera Omnia, Lyons, 1684.

[22] Apud Del Giudice, *Stipendia Missarum;* Romae, 1922, p. 131.

[23] Laymann, *Theol. Moralis,* Patavii, 1733, l. 4, Tract. 10, cap. VIII, 4, n. 41.

[24] Del Giudice, *Stipendia Missarum,* Romae, 1922, p. 143.

[25] Suarez, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae,* disp. 86, sect. 1: "Intervenit ergo ibi vera ratio justitiae fundata in mutuo consensu utrinque oneroso, qui ex-

Mass stipends form a part of a bilateral, innominate contract of the species, "do ut facias". This means that one party agrees to *give* something; namely, the usual monetary offering, whilst the other party, the priest, agrees to *do* something; namely, to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Mass and to apply its so-called special fruit according to the intention of the donor of the stipend. "Special fruit" is a technical term whose meaning is not obvious. The fruits of the Mass are not identical with its value or its worth. The Mass's value is its intrinsic power to produce its effects, whilst its fruits are the good things that God confers in view of the Sacrifice. In itself, the value of the Mass is infinite; but in its application or in its fruits it is finite though indefinite.[26] Hence, the statement that one Mass is sufficient to free all the souls in purgatory is true as far as the value of the Mass is concerned; but the statement is false or at least doubtful as regards the fruits of the Mass. Consequently, it is lawful and expedient to offer several Masses for the same deceased person.[27]

To explain stipends correctly, a priest must know what is meant by the application of the Mass's special fruit. When the celebrant of a Mass offers it "ad intentionem dantis," he does not mean to exclude the rest of the faithful from a participation in the benefits accruing from the Holy Sacrifice. Neither the priest nor the Church, but God alone, distributes these graces, according to the dictates of His infinite perfections. In return for the stipend which the priest accepts, the celebrant of the Mass simply presents the giver of the stipend at the court of Heaven as an applicant for favors by pleading especially for him. If God in His wisdom and justice sees fit to overrule the petition, the good resulting from that particular Mass is not thereby frustrated; but it is applied to more deserving members in the communion of saints.

plicatur illis verbis, do ut facias. Hic est autem titulus justitiae." Cf. Gasparri, "Tract. Can. De Sacramento Eucharistiae", Vol. I, p. 394: Paris, 1897, "Est inter sacerdotem et fidelem contractus innominatus, do ut facias."

[26] Cf. Gasparri, ibid. n. 492. On the other hand Gasparri adds that, since there is a probable opinion that the fruit of the Mass is infinite, priests should act on this probable opinion by making a secondary intention for every Mass (e. g. by offering the Mass "salvo iure dantis" for their relatives etc.); and that, in virtue of the same probable opinion, they can fulfill with one Mass their obligation of justice to the giver of the stipend and also discharge some other obligation of charity, vow or promise.

[27] Cf. Tanquerey, *Theol. Dog.*, Vol. III, n. 701; Parisiis, 1920.

By accepting an offering, the priest does not give to any person a right to such and such a grace. He only assumes the obligation of offering the Holy Sacrifice according to the intention of the giver. How much benefit that person shall derive from the Mass is left to God alone. Thus the Church through her ministers does no man any wrong. She compels no one to make an offering for a Mass; and when the offering has been made, she does not give the donor a monopoly of the fruits of the Mass. But she does prevent as far as possible every form of abuse that could attach to this delicate transaction. As a result of the Church's legislation on stipends, the layman is prevented from making unreasonable demands upon the time or the rights of the priest; for the person who asks for a Mass must remunerate the celebrant for this special priestly service. On the other hand, the priest cannot cloak his avarice under the doctrine of the Mass's infinite worth to demand an exorbitant offering for a single Mass or to accept many stipends for one and the same Mass, because the Church prescribes the exact amount that may be demanded as a stipend for a Mass.[28]

The fruits of the Mass are produced *ex opere operantis* and *ex opere operato*. The fruits produced *ex opere operantis* are explained by the apothegm, "Quo sanctior sacerdos, eo gratiosior oblatio". The fruits of the Mass are produced *ex opere operato* in the sense that they transcend the action of those who offer the Holy Sacrifice.[29] The fruit *ex opere operato* is threefold: 1. general — which comes to all the faithful and cannot be restricted by the priest to any individual; 2. special — which may be applied by the priest in the sense explained above;[30] 3. very special or personal — which belongs to the priest alone.

The fundamental thesis regarding Mass stipends may be formulated into the proposition that every priest who celebrates Mass can apply the special fruit of that Mass to a person capable of receiving it. Catholics are bound to believe

[28] Cf. Link, *Mess-stipendien,* Regensburg, 1901, p. 179.

[29] De La Taille, *Mysterium Fidei,* Parisiis, 1921, p. 321, footnote 1: "Ideoque dicitur ex opere operato, quia transcendit omne opus sive operantis individui, puta sacerdotis celebrantis, sive etiam operantis collective, id est Ecclesiae deferentis."

[30] Cappello, *De Sacramentis,* Romae, 1921; Vol. 1, n. 580: "Fructus ministerialis (ab aliis specialis vel medius vocatus) ille dicitur qui, ex determinata sacerdotis intentione, alicui personae vel fini applicatur."

that priests have this power; for Pope Pius VI condemned the denial of this power as false, rash, pernicious, injurious to the Church and conducive to Wyclif's error.[31] But the priest who accepts a stipend must prove more than this. He must demonstrate not only his power to make a special intercession for an individual but also his right to demand a sum of money for that favor. This demonstration is not a matter of exegesis or of ethics. It is a theological problem, and it must be solved theologically. It is solved theologically in canon 824 of the Code. Of course this canon is not the canon of an ecumenical council, nor is it an *ex cathedra* pronouncement of an infallible pope. But it is a solemn declaration, made by experts after mature deliberation and with the approval of Christ's vicar upon earth, that "according to an established and approved custom of the Church, any priest who says and applies holy Mass may receive an alms or stipend".[32]

Every word of this canon is pregnant with theological connotations. The word "established" suggests the fact that the practice of giving and accepting stipends, having existed for centuries, is venerable because of its antiquity. Moreover this usage is said to be an approved custom of the Church. It has the approval of the hierarchy, which has frequently legislated against abuses attendant upon stipends but has never condemned the acceptance of the stipends. It has also the approval of the faithful, who for centuries have given stipends, offerings or "eleemosynas" in one form or another. Finally the word "may" clinches the argument. When we read this verb "licet" in canon 824 of the Code of Pius X, may we not exclaim as devout Catholics, if not as meticulous theologians, "Roma locuta est, causa finita est"?

At least we may take the words of the Code as a concise statement of the argument from tradition. The argument from tradition is the best proof for the liceity of stipends. The history of Mass stipends is their best defence, their glorious apologia. Not only the historian but the philosopher also and the theologian as well, if they read history with unbiased minds, must conclude with Suarez that Mass stipends are a

[31] Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, Friburgi, 1922, n. 1530 (resp. 1393).

[32] Canon 824, par. 1, "Secundum receptum et probatum Ecclesiae morem atque institutum, sacerdoti cuilibet Missam celebranti et applicanti licet eleemosynam seu stipendium recipere."

legitimate source of income for priests because these offerings are based upon the dictates of the natural law, upon the doctrines of Christ and His Apostle to the Gentiles, and upon the tradition that every priest may live from the altar which he serves.[33]

Two more words of canon 824 are worthy of a moment's consideration. *Stipendium* and *eleemosyna* may have been used as synonyms by the authors of the Code. But the English stipend and alms are not synonymous expressions. *Eleemosyna* may suggest to a scholar that stipends take their origin from the primitive offerings which were intended for the support of the poor as well as of the clergy, and that many a missionary is able to live on the stipend which he receives for his daily Mass. Nevertheless the English equivalent, "alms," fails to suggest these ideas to the average Catholic; and the word is never used to signify an offering for a Mass. Hence an American pastor who is overburdened with five-dollar "intentions" may send a dollar to an African missionary with this curt epistle, "Accipe hanc eleemosynam et lege Missam ad intentionem dantis". But that same pastor would not dare to hand a dollar to his curate with the remark, "Here is an *alms* for the Mass which I asked you to say".[34]

Priests often speak about intentions. They announce intentions on Sundays; they have plenty of intentions; they have to send some intentions away. This is all very good and true. But when they begin to lament the scarcity of two-dollar intentions in their own parish and to bewail the abundance of one-dollar intentions in other parishes, it is time to make a philological pause. For the intention to apply a Mass is one thing; the remuneration is quite a different thing.

Then, too, a venal person will try to pay for a Mass. An insolent one will order a Mass. An ignorant man will ask, "How much does a Mass cost?" An educated lady will inquire, "What is the usual offering for a Mass?" In fact, as

[33] Suarez (Comm. et Disput. in III p. S. Thom. de Eucharistia disp. 86, sect. 1) apud Link, *Mess-stipendien*, p. 199: "Dicere omnia stipendia Missae, quae in ecclesia dantur et recipiuntur, esse simoniaca, impius error est et intolerabilis, cum universa ecclesia eiusque pastores huiusmodi consuetudinem approbent et illis principiis traditis a Christo (Luc. X) et a Paulo (I. Cor. IX), quae ipsa etiam naturali ratione nituntur."

[34] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, Romae, 1922, Vol. II, p. 58, n. 108, no. 3.

an alternative for *stipend, offering* seems to serve quite well. It is historically correct; it is theologically unobjectionable; above all, it is sanctioned by good usage. In the ultimate analysis, however, it is not a synonym for *stipend,* because it is a generic term which does not differentiate the offering for a Mass from the offering on the occasion of a baptism or a mission. The word *stipend* is the only term that fully expresses all that is contained in a correct concept of the subject under consideration. This name may reek with blood and carnage and the spoils of war. It may conjure up mental images of Cæsar's mercenaries and of Hessian hirelings.[35] Nevertheless, the priest who wishes to be precise in his choice of words to express delicate shades of thought will hesitate to use any other term than stipend to designate his sacrificial remuneration.

CHARLES F. KELLER.

Allentown, Pennsylvania.

SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE EXODUS.

THE social usages and the economic problems of the Jews are inseparably interwoven with their history. The sacred writers did not observe explicitly, perhaps they only dimly recognized, the importance of social and economic currents in Jewish life.

Deliberately, or perhaps unconsciously, sociology and economics were regarded as mere components of history. This attitude, while, on the one hand, it missed the niceties of analysis; on the other, escaped the unbalanced judgments of dissociated observation. The hagiographer, though desiring his manuscript to be scholarly, was concerned that it should not be complex. His glance, at most, beheld for what they were the sociological and economic implications of his theme; or rather it disdained to give them being distinct from the sacred history. Unity of purpose, recommended to the profane scribe, was inescapable in the amanuensis of Him whose act can not be complex. Rejecting the multifarious approaches of science to human chronicle, he paved the way of

[35] Cf. Cicero, *Stipendium militibus persolvere,* apud Freund-Leverett's *Lexicon of the Latin Language,* Phila., 1850, s.v. "Stipendium". Cf. Vulgate, "Quis militat suis stipendiis unquam?" (I Cor., 9:7).

the latest of them by a simple narrative, pregnant with the undivided Wisdom of Eternity.

Jacob's journey to Egypt, hitherto an example of parental affection, divulges to the economist an enforced quest of food; to the sociologist, the embryonic stage of national consciousness. The former concentrates upon the cause of the migration; the latter, on its effect. Interpreting tribal migrations as partially impelled by inadequate harvests, the economist draws confirmation from the Scriptural history of Jacob. Group resistance to external peril, a modestly axiomatic principle of sociology, may cite as argument for itself the cohesive growth of the Hebrew tribes under drastic external oppression. The drudgery of Egyptian kilns aroused the economic urge for freedom; but the personification in a deliverer of the nation's hopes was the sociological impulse toward the Promised Land.

Ideals, though they have inspired men to culture and spirituality, are clipped by economic necessity. Duty beckons, but material want retards. Zealots in prosperity but modestly enthuse in adversity; the comfortable defender of the law too quickly tempers his defence when comfort leaves; the unintelligent partisan of a propitious god, too readily, when the brazen hands are empty, markets the idol brass for food. Economic pressure, from the instability of men's wills, might seem the standard bearer, or perhaps the latest knave, of the forces of the flesh against the mind.

The seemingly interminable journey that lay before them, and, still more, the impassable sea that lay behind, intensified with anxiety the economic cravings of the Hebrew emigrants. Thirst became unbearable; and hunger, a sore temptation. Murmurs against their liberator droned through the third day of their journey from the sea. An ideal yielded to a thirst; a hope was centered in a fountain. In the shadow of Sinai itself, a present threat accompanied a longing for the past. The stones with which they threatened Moses did not recall the bricks of Egypt. National aspirations were withered by a thirst; and the slavery of the Nile, watered with regrets, cast off its hideousness to become desirable. Four decades of years seem only to have hallowed the memories of slavery; the posterity of an extinct generation, burning with parched throats

and indignant minds, extolled a land from which its fathers fled. The instable loyalty of the throng, if not the persistent recurrence of rebellion, provoked its leader to a sense of its unworthiness. Though twice before refreshing water had obeyed his call, he doubted now the generosity of God. A double stroke, and the skepticism that produced it, excluded from the Promised Land the deliverer of an insatiable, unsteady race.

The taste for food, if less urgent than the demand for drink, was not less inimical to the people's faith. Between Elim and Sinai, inconstancy exalted death in Egypt because the means to live had fled the sandy desert. The meager fare of servitude is glorified, and the slave's canteen becomes the banquet of a king. The indignation of Jehovah, tempered by His prevision of this ingratitude, yielded to His magnanimity. A bounteous repast of rich and satisfying fowl repaid the grumbling of the greedy slaves. A sustaining, if less appetizing, food He sent them daily, falling from the clouds. Pellets of honeyed bread were rained upon the camp, that every man might gather his appointed measure for the day. On the Sabbath only they did not fall, though food sufficient for that day was sent the day before. More than his share no man might have, though greedy eye commanded grasping hand to more. His avaricious, if not irreligious, labor proved unavailing; and, though he might struggle all the day, his harvest dwindled as his toil increased. Parsimony was discouraged; or, rather positively proscribed. To stint oneself spared a banquet for the worms. To-day's provisions could not be hoarded for the morrow; to-morrow's dawn would find it all corrupt.

An unvaried diet, though nutritious, in time becomes insipid. Taste, though it serves a rational end, is capable of caprice. Savory food, even the most delicious, palls, by repetition, on the most sensitive, as on the least discerning, palate. The memory of other foods, fortified by their scarcity, engenders a desire which, if less than mania, is more than whim. Relish for the recurring menu peremptorily surrenders, if not to nausea, at least to irritation and ennui. Two years of dining on the honeyed dew repelled the Hebrews' wish to hoard, even their desire to eat. The humble, though more savory,

dishes of the servile board rose up to taunt them with variety. Their censure, mingled with bitter criticism, fastened upon the leader who made them forfeit it. Rumblings of rebellion, softened by the spell of Sinai, rolled ominously through the camp. The supreme power of Moses was secretly, but dangerously, challenged. His pretensions were scrutinized; his qualifications, contemned. The hardships of the throng were magnified; his privations, despised. The rebels too vividly remembered that they were upon a waste; they scornfully forgot that he was with them. They could not obediently submit to authority; but they minimized the task of wise discretion.

Economic scarcity was measured, as it always is, in contrast with temporarily unattainable standards. The needs of the wanderers, if they were physical at all, were, as generally occurs, principally psychological. Even psychological needs, however, if they do not direct the currents of social process, profoundly modify and check them. The mental yearnings of the Jews, trusting that an abler leader would guide them more speedily to the fertile land, or find a way to bring them back to Egypt, prepared them to degrade the man who once had held their confidence. Leadership is dominant so long as it can wield, if not psychological or moral, at least physical, power over those whom it aims to lead. Denied the sanction of a standing bodyguard, Moses depended upon his personal claim to obedience, if not upon the willingness of his countrymen to obey. The real hardships, exaggerated into fancied disasters, of the journey, practically obliterated Moses' title to their loyalty, and threw in shadow the people's obligations to submit to him in conscience.

Before the massy sphere of earth was formed, Jehovah's eye, straining in indignation, but restrained by pity, saw that it would be so. Decreed in eternity, though reserved for time, an imperial edict provided mercifully that rebellion should be forestalled. The might of office, and the weight of power, were to be shared by seventy adjutants to the theocratic judge. A check they might be, an aid they must be, in the exercise of governmental sway. The envious reproach of discontent, rather than an injudicious solicitude for the nation's weal, applauded the decentralization of authority. Impatience with

the outcome of their pilgrimage, and the propensity to blame it on the injustice, or the incompetence, of their leader, provoked the Jews to believe that injustice would be less peremptory, and incompetence less disastrous, if both became less tyrannous through restriction of their domain. They could not see that genius would be hampered, and stupidity made seventy times more probable, by this partition of the governing power.

The pinnacle on which Moses had stood when the Paschal Lamb was slain, was ominously tottering, if it had not already sunken in the sand. The impulse toward the Exodus which his personality had inspired, or rather the fervid complacence with which the nation had united its destiny with his own, now exercised a doubtful ascendancy over its policies, and became, perhaps, even more tenuous after the partition of his power. The democratic delegation of the liberator's authority was a concession, as it is so frequently, to dissatisfaction, temporary, but threatening, with the institutions of monarchy. It was the fruit of protest, silent, but informative; perhaps unseasonable aspiration for democracy was the seed from which protest sprang.

This merciful compromise, ordained before Time's pageantry began, was followed by a companion measure, framed also to compose the mental turbulence that might issue in revolt. The lanes between the tents, and the desert surrounding them, were to be filled with quails driven from the sea. A full month's food supply would be delivered to the camp.

Surrender to another's whim, when he will not see the meanness of his caprice, may instil the lesson by experiment. Concession to another's fancy, though it seems a triumph of appetite, may prove the exaltation of restraint. Every desire, no matter how prejudice may applaud, must hang its head in guilt before the judge of sad experience. Gratitude for present favors, though suspended by ungracious murmuring at present wants, may be reinstated by disgust at the disadvantages concomitant with their satisfaction. Spiritual insight, though temporarily exiled by thoughtless impetuosity, may be ransomed when sensuality permits wiser counsels to prevail.

Thus, the tempting morsels that the sea breath brought the Jews, distracted first their thoughts from contemplation of

rebellion, then by a plague laid prostrate the arm that would have struck. The physical disaster to which their appetites had led them, while charged to Him who heeded murmuring, bore witness to the superiority of His plans and the effeminacy of their own. Thus overweening confidence in national policies is chastened by their frustration. Their fallibility, if not their inopportuneness, stands ashamed beneath the searching light of failure. Older measures, which they were meant to nullify, are looked upon with gracious eye, and may be reëstablished by popular demand. Obedience to Jehovah, thrust shackled into the gloomy cave of utter scorn, was proudly brought unshackled into camp, once gluttony had been rebuked. But the seams and crevices wrought in the Jewish character by meditation of revolt were not to be leveled till through them should be poured the furious volcanic upheaval of a thwarted, racial pride.

A statesman's kindred, though they may be the solace of an adverse hour, may themselves entangle him in adversity. The venom of domestic quarrels may poison all the veins of civil life, and by its virulence inhibit the functioning of community government. The fumes of petty disagreement, arising from the family vault, and mingling with the vaporous exhalations of a thousand animosities, may suffocate a nation, and leave deserted its administrative halls. The keen analysis of a statesman's qualifications, a luckless omen of his impending ruin, can nowhere be more minute, nowhere more incisive, than in the assembly of his kindred. Injured family pride, if it can challenge the injury as contempt of tribe, may summon tribal influence to vengeance.

The Gentile birth of Moses' wife, the more reprehensible for her high estate, must have made unenviable her contacts with his race. The least choleric of men, if provoked to exasperation, may by the fury of his wrath exceed the violence of the most irascible. Sephora, no matter with what patience she might endure disdain, contempt, and scorn, must some day rise in indignation to repel the unwarranted attack. Weapons are ever cruel, even when fashioned by the tongue. Sephora's tongue would fashion weapons of the common mold, and, granted normal accuracy of aim, would inflict an injury not unprovoked. The provocation, though venerable with age,

would escape the none too self-accusatory observation of the wounded, while insulted dignity would clamor for an adequate satisfaction.

Thus, Mary, the sister of Moses, and Aaron, his brother, had reason to complain of his wife's audacity. Moses, though the meekest of men, had often seen their spitefulness toward one he dearly loved. This unbecoming conduct he dispassionately recalled, regarding the outburst of his wife as worthy retribution. Chagrined and chastened, with anticipated vindication denied them, they nourished the glowing embers of their cravings for revenge.

Still dizzy with rebellious sentiments, or only incompletely sobered from the intoxication of revolt, they challenged the title of Moses to preëminence. Remembering some vision, a bounteous favor from on high, they found occasion to reject the vicar of their Benefactor. The prophetic visitation, with careless disregard of fact, they paralleled with the forty days' apparition on Sinai. The people, never too scientific in weighing facts, and laboring under the peculiar logic of rebellion, supinely agreed with the deductions of unscrupulous dialectic. To anticipate the practical consequences of speculative fallacy, if not to rebuke the uncurbed folly of inexact intelligence, Almighty God benignly intervened.

From the memoranda of Infinity He set the facts aright, discounting the significance of Mary's and Aaron's privileges, and exalting the majestic station of His delegate. To avenge the truth, to promote logical exactness, and to intercept all insubordination, the leaders of the political assault God effectually chastised. Mary was stricken with leprosy; but Aaron, that the priesthood might be undefiled, was preserved by Moses' prayer. The meekness of her brother saved Mary, too, from the clutches of her disease. The ambitious soul, imprisoned seven days within a fetid corpse, and segregated from the companionship of those whose applause she coveted, humiliated at length, was given back a healthy residence. Through Moses' intercession, Mary was restored to her companions, cleansed of her affliction. Class consciousness had struggled against a foreign element in the social structure, and the climax of its opposition was an ill aimed and badly planned assault. It was inconsistent, if not suicidal, to assert pre-

dominance of caste by an attack on its supreme exemplar, in whom its hopes began, without whom its hopes were vain.

The lethargic, if not begrudged compliance with what was deemed inevitable, was hardly the spirit needed for a unified attack upon a well defended realm. It was in the midst of this indifference, if not actual discontent, that the wanderers reached the borders of the Promised Land. To revive their forsaken enthusiasm, and to give them every opportunity to coöperate with His plan, Jehovah commanded that scouts be sent to view its hills and vales. Cowardice had become epidemic, and indolence, sheltered in its mantle, had a place at every board. The general inertia made it difficult to discover spirited, or fearless, lieutenants.

It was almost imperative that the characteristics of the Promised Land should receive intensive publicity in the Jewish camp. An extensive campaign was needed to advertise the properties of the territory which God had pledged. A glowing account of its resources might stir up the energy required to take possession. Propitious propaganda might throttle discouragement, and lead an optimistic people to its heritage. Hopeful, trustful, faithful, courageous men were needed for the mission of education.

The scouts, as the event disclosed, were no less pessimistic than their neighbors. Two only of the twelve had the daring, and the faith, of men who trust in God. The land's fertility not one of them denied; but ten exaggerated the strength of its defenders. Pusillanimous, they contrasted the disunion of their countrymen with the stature of the possessors of the land, and the seeming impregnability of their towns. They miscalculated the coöperative and resistive power of the inhabitants; they disregarded completely the irresistible onslaught of which their own troops, with the aid of God, were capable. Their inspection tour of forty days would better have been neglected. Lost vigor sponsored in their countrymen an unwillingness to contest the land's possession. Provoking irresponsibility created desires to possess it without challenge. So, enervated manhood, and sentimental womanhood, were maddened at the report the scouts returned. The temperate description of the soil's fertility, obscured by the florid portrayal of the land's defence, cast a frenzy of despair

on the more emotional, and a spell of anarchy on the more designing. Josue and Caleb, shouting in vain their more accurate estimate of the chances of victory, were threatened with menacing glances, and with ponderous stones, as a reward for their unacceptable news. The incompetent reporters, false corroborators of imagined peril, were punished more summarily than the unscrupulous news gatherers of this age. The death penalty, immediately executed by God, was their punishment for the malicious agitation of resentment in their countrymen. The obstinacy of the nation, which refused to advance to triumph, was met by God with a decree that should have satisfied their sloth. If they would not trust Him for victory, they might wander forty years on desert soil. Not one of them whose years exceeded twenty at the Exodus would enter into the Promised Land.

Then, so unstable is the rancor of the soul, the arms that would not battle in obedience to God, took up the sword to seek success in spite of Him. Moses, who would have led them bravely in every lawful contest, refused to fight when God enjoined repose. A badly disciplined corps, bitter of heart and benumbed with purposeless wrath, hurled itself with desperation against the Amalecites. Poorly regimented, but with the dash and daring of the desert, these Arab wanderers, though once defeated by Moses at Sinai's foot, now scattered the aimless Hebrews as sand upon the waste. The decree of God was inflexible; the nation must wander, vagabonds, through forty sullen years.

The sociologist sees in the scouts' report the usual tendency to offer news that caters to the current taste. In what way the reporter is influenced, or by what forces urged, his mind and pen seem captives of the expected. His own mental reactions, fashioned by his age, likely interpret objective reality in its spirit. Uncourageous, he may flee the opportunity to antagonize his countrymen, and suppress what may be disconcerting to them. Or, in the unworthiness of his mind, personal convenience may subvert the truth to glorify the acceptable and the palatable. Anyone of, or perhaps all, these motives may have actuated the scouts. They fulfilled the fears of their countrymen, and this, though driving them to desperation, was just what they expected and desired. They

paid no heed to Josue and Caleb, who brought more hopeful, if contradictory, accounts. This news, though filled with optimism, was not that for which they hoped. They seized the less propitious notice, as men are prone to do, because it satisfied their prophecy and tickled their secret pride. Josue and Caleb struggled, as apostles of the unpopular must ever strive, against the preconceptions of the race. While propaganda for the current vogue is rolled beneath the tongue, the presentation of its contrary is the victim of abuse. The unpopular invites scornful contradiction. Josue and Caleb were the visionaries of their day; though threatened, they seemed too despicable to deserve the punishment of death.

The flame of rage enkindled at the futility of their efforts, fanned by the inevitability of a desert death, strained to escape the vaults of mind and envelop some victim of revenge. Ambition, if once it might have whispered to the mercurial soul rebellion, could not be blamed for, could hardly even be suspected of, inspiring the petulance that issued in revolt. The loitering throngs, burning with fruitless indignation, with scornful lip and piercing tongue, arraigned their own, and their countrymen's, subservience. Their abjectness scored, and their initiative challenged, the Levites took the field against their guide. Two hundred and fifty, driven almost frantic by their impotence, smarting under the sarcasm of their countrymen, and incited by the belief that they championed a race's cause, denied the right of Moses to lead them, and were swallowed by the earth in punishment.

The uselessness of resistance, so tragically portrayed, could not deter the people from, perhaps impelled them to, more general revolt. As gamblers stake their last possession to overcome bad luck, so races hazard liberty and life to gain a prize beyond their reach. A mob, with all its lawlessness and irresponsibility, grew dangerously, threateningly, irresistibly, as it rolled toward Moses' tent. Forewarned, but trusting in no human aid, Moses and Aaron sought the refuge of the Tabernacle. Bloodthirsty though they were, the enemies of the priesthood still stood in awe before the memorial of Sinai.

The inexplicable vacillation of rampant brutality, whether it be the bestial fury of the mob or the instinctive rage of the herd, halted the impetuous charge at the very portals of the

Holy Place. As the cowering wolf, frustrated by some invisible force, perplexing yet imperative, walks round his victim, sly of eye, slow of pace, vigilant of gaze, so the Jews turned brute, walked round the Tent of God, dubiously, sullenly, perhaps guiltily, but surely watchfully. Their hands, though spared the crime, could not absolve the souls that had designed it. The seditious throng, unwilling to be dispersed, was scattered, not by the riot clubs of policemen or the tear gas of the militia, but by a flaming gas, tenuous, combustible, consuming, and inescapable. Fifteen thousand of the guilty perished in its grasp before the intercession of Moses dispelled it from their midst. So drastic was the visitation that hatred, its attempts to act frustrated, found itself compelled to pine away in disappointment and despair. The flowering of Aaron's rod, preferred before the staffs of the twelve non-priestly tribes, extorted from the less morbid an ungracious recognition of his leadership; from the insatiable, no more than protesting assent.

Time, benign, has medicines to compose the transitory disorders of the social group. Thirty-eight years witnessed, every one in turn, a diminution of the tenacity of rebellious purpose among the Jews. Evil men when dead have no active influence; enfeebled age is too indifferent to rebel. A new generation mourned Aaron's death for thirty days; so, later on, the death of Moses. A clamor for water and a resentment of fatigue burst from the younger group just before the conquest of the Land. These were but the rumblings of discontent, comparable to the ingratitude of their fathers. But the spirit of revolt was laid; the persons of Moses and Aaron were sacred. The wounds of one age thus frequently become merely the scars of its successor. Dissension in one generation thus often surrenders to amiability in the next. Disunion among ancestors may flee before the cohesion of posterity. Through forty years union was restored to Israel by the slow vexatious, knitting process of Time; and union, under God, brought safely into the Promised Land the children of men whom disunion caused to forfeit it.

Sociological laws reach beyond ethics. They are *a posteriori;* ethics is *a priori.* Sociology is the fruit of history, the profit of experience. It shows how society moves and acts,

by what forces urged, by what causes influenced. It has a place for personal freedom, as well as external impulse; for religious, as for profane, idealism. The interplay of these numerous factors in the story of the Exodus supplies an interesting study in social contacts; the dramatic triumph of religion and personal will, in no small degree accomplished, under God's Providence, through the functioning of those laws, is consoling evidence that God directs the worst tendencies of humanity, as its best, to the accomplishment of His eternal plan.

JEROME D. HANNAN.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

SCANDALIZING THE LITTLE ONES.

WHO are the little ones, and how are they scandalized? Of course, the most obvious answer is that the little ones are children, and that they are scandalized by anyone who offers an occasion of sin to them.

But sometimes there seems to be another group thought of as little ones. The words and the conduct of great numbers at least imply that the little ones are those who are like children in their simple-minded, uneducated faith, believing implicitly and readily pious legends that will not bear the searchlight of historical investigation, attributing an even superstitious power to the scapulars, or to some medal, or litany.

We are warned, therefore, not to scandalize these little ones by attempting to apply historical methods to the pious stories of the saints, or to distinguish accurately between the sacraments working *ex opere operato,* and the sacramentals working *ex opere operantis.* It is admitted that these "little ones" are too credulous and superstitious, but it is argued that this cockle of credulity should be allowed to grow until the harvest, for fear of rooting up the wheat of true faith.

Now, I have no objection to people believing pious tales if they want to. And perhaps most of what seems to be superstition can be explained in some other way. Doubtless, too, we should be very careful not to do anything to disturb the faith of simple souls. But I do not see that these simple-minded, credulous people are the "little ones". On the con-

trary, they are the "big ones". Their faith is so big and strong and sturdy that they are credulous.

And I cannot see that there is much danger of destroying the flourishing tree of their faith by trying to prune a little of the luxuriant growth of credulity. The probability is that the pruning can't be done, that they will stick to their beliefs and practices.

There is, however, another class that deserves much more the title of "little ones". I mean those people who have difficulty in believing at all. Their faith is really little. It is different from the easy credulity of the superstitious. By considerable effort they can swallow a gnat, as it were, in the shape of the minimum requirements of Catholic Faith; but if you insist on their swallowing the camel of all the excrescences of pious fancy, they are likely to recoil from even the gnat.

It seems to me that the sensitiveness of these "little ones" has not been sufficiently considered by some people. Those of robust faith, who can believe anything, have rather despised them; just as those of robust physical digestion, who can eat anything, rather despise the dyspeptic who has to be careful of his diet. Sometimes these ones of little faith have been scandalized, and the ones who did the scandalizing have prided themselves on their accomplishment.

Newman, who himself suffered so much at the hands of self-constituted guardians of the Faith, had a very keen sympathy for the intellectuals who could not be credulous. His whole life ought to be a lesson to those who scandalize "little ones". But, unfortunately, that lesson has not been learned. We can still say, as Newman wrote more than fifty years ago, "There are those among us who for years past have conducted themselves as if no responsibility attached to wild words and overbearing deeds; who have stated truths in the most paradoxical form, and stretched principles till they were close upon snapping."[1]

It is a very serious thing to undermine the faith of another. But it is not so generally recognized as it should be that there are two ways of undermining faith. One is by a direct attack on what another believes. And certainly those of simple,

[1] *Letters to the Duke of Norfolk,* replying to Gladstone's pamphlet on Vaticanism, printed in *Difficulties of Anglicans,* Vol. II, page 177.

credulous faith (so long as they believe nothing contrary to the Church's teaching) should be protected from such attacks. We cannot too strongly condemn the attitude of mind that would want to endanger their Catholic faith by carelessly rooting up excrescences.

But our indignation against those who would scandalize these simple souls, ought not to blind us to the fact that there is another way of destroying faith, though it is applicable to a very different group. That other way is by asking a certain type of mind to believe too much. It puts too great a strain upon faith. There are those whose faith will break down if it is overloaded with too many beliefs, just as surely as an overloaded bridge will break.

The "little one" staggering through the desert of doubt, clutching his pack of beliefs and fighting off as best he can the attacks of unbelief, deserves the pity of the ones of big faith. New burdens, going beyond what the Church insists upon, ought not recklessly to be thrown upon him. His salvation lies in an accurate distinction between what is of faith, and what is not, rather than in putting common opinions and pious beliefs and infallible definitions all on the same basis.

If it be offensive to pious ears to deny what is a common opinion, it is even more offensive to the ears of these "little ones" to raise a common opinion to the level of a *de fide* declaration. And should not these "little ones" be considered as well as the "pious ears"? Apart from the matter of truth, I suppose the "pious ears" can stand it better than the "little ones". The "pious ears" are not going to lose their faith over the matter. They will simply call you names for placing their pet belief in a lower category than they think it deserves.

What I am pleading for is sympathy for the "little ones", for those of little faith, that nothing will be done unnecessarily to scandalize them. If the "big ones" want to believe a great deal more than the Church demands, that is their privilege. But let them believe it without trying to compel other people to believe also, and without parading their belief in such a way as to be offensive to those who accept the freedom the Church gives of not believing.

For instance, no private revelation after the death of the last Apostle can be made a matter of faith. The Church sanctions

devotion to the Sacred Heart, but she has not and cannot put revelations to St. Margaret Mary on the same footing with those in the New Testament. That is, an individual Catholic is not a heretic if he looks upon these revelations to St. Margaret Mary as subjective deceptions. He ought not to go around disturbing other people by voicing his doubts and objections; but then, neither should other people disturb him by attempting to force him to believe this as he believes St. John's Apocalypse.

It is true that disbelief in these particular revelations to St. Margaret Mary might come not from a distrust of the evidence in the case, but from a conviction that miracles do not happen to-day. That would be an un-Catholic attitude. But I am assuming that the "little ones" condemned by those of big faith simply find the proof offered unsatisfactory. They are not denying what is or what can ever be a matter of faith.

Or, again, as a Catholic one must believe in the Communion of Saints, and in the possibility of their interceding for us with God. But one does not have to pray to any particular saint, much less does one have to take up with the latest fashion in this field. If St. Expedite does not appeal to a particular individual, that is his business. Those who are interested in propagating St. Expedite's devotion ought not to dragoon anyone into saying litanies by the threat of otherwise being a bad Catholic. And the same thing applies to the Little Flower.

What I am deploring is the attitude on the part of those of big faith toward those of little faith. Instead of the sweet reasonableness that might lead on to a development of faith, there is too often a pugnacity that repels. We miss the spirit of Christian charity. And we must remember that St. Paul ranks charity above even faith.

For instance, I know one man of big faith who can believe anything. He can believe in the Immaculate Conception, the cures at Lourdes, and the translation of the Holy House of Loreto; the revelations of the Apocalypse, and those to Margaret Mary, and that Teresa Higginson possessed such miraculous power of bilocation that she was engaged in missionary work in distant countries while she was teaching school in a provincial English town. Apparently he believes all these things with the same firmness as all revealed by God with equal authoritativeness.

Doubtless such faith is quite admirable, and perhaps to be envied by the "little ones". But my friend does not stop there. He possesses a crusading spirit that makes him attack every person who dares to doubt in the slightest any one of these beliefs. He wants everybody else to believe all these things, too, just as readily as he does. And if they do not believe, he thinks that they are at least suspected of heresy.

As my friend puts it, a Catholic nose smells heresy as a Puritan nose smells rum. The comparison is apt, as far as his ilk are concerned, though we may doubt the Catholicity of their noses. They are like nothing so much as a snooping Anti-Saloon Leaguer trying to regulate the private lives of everybody around him, and always suspecting that other people are violating the Volstead Law. The heresy-hunters are constantly sticking their noses into other folk's business. St. Teresa once exclaimed, "From foolish devotions, good Lord deliver us!" And from her own bitter experience she might have added another petition to the litany — "From self-constituted inquisitors, good Lord deliver us!"

Under the Spanish Inquisition there was at least an official court to which appeal could be made, there was a fair trial, and the possibility of acquittal. But with these private heresy-hunters of to-day one stands no chance whatever. They bandy about charges of heresy in the most reckless manner, and there is no redress. If they accuse one wrongly, instead of being remorseful about it and trying to make restitution as best they can, they take pride in thinking that such vigilance on their part is at least necessary to keep the unsafe men from becoming too bold in the expression of their opinions.

Of course, these smellers-out of heresy would not to-day call it heretical to say that the earth moves around the sun. But it was their type that said this four centuries ago, and that has given us such a deal of explaining to do now. And they are to-day, perhaps, piling up similar trouble for a future generation. They go beyond the Church in adding to the Faith, or they interpret some official declaration in a sense that was not necessarily intended. Because they are following their own inclination, they do not realize that they are scandalizing some "little ones". Were not the Pharisees their spiritual ancestors, to whom Christ said: "Woe to you lawyers also, because you load men with burdens which they cannot bear." ?[2]

[2] Luke, 11:46.

And in the next verse Christ exclaimed, "Woe to you who build monuments of the prophets: and your fathers killed them." The same type of mind that scandalizes the "little ones" of to-day, persecuted the Saints of other ages. It was they who lighted the faggots for Joan of Arc, who haled Ignatius before the Inquisition, who imprisoned John of the Cross, who cramped and hampered John Regis at every turn. But to-day they canonize them, and build monuments and altars and churches to their memory.

An illustration of how the smellers-out of heresy work comes pat in connexion with evolution. The Biblical Commission declared that it would be erroneous to interpret Genesis in such a way as to deny the special creation of man. Immediately, then, our unofficial inquisitors want to call it heresy to affirm that man's body was evolved from lower organisms. But man is composed of body and soul, and until the Biblical Commission, or some other authoritative source, makes it clear that the special creation of man's soul and the infusion of it into a body previously evolved from lower organisms would not satisfy the declaration of 30 June, 1909, private, unauthorized individuals ought not to condemn those who see no incompatibility.

Going beyond the strict meaning of the Biblical Commission in this way may be putting a great strain on the faith of "little ones," and may be seriously scandalizing them. Those who are not familiar with the technical literature of theology may, unfortunately, believe that these self-constituted heresy-hunters are correctly representing the Church, and the effort they have to make to agree may be the beginning of a weakening of faith, which ultimately may lead to complete loss; whereas they could have been saved by a little Christian sympathy and charity in accurately stating the teaching of the Church.

I know that loss of faith is frequently attributed to intellectual pride. And in a good many instances pride may be the cause of loss of faith. But I am not speaking of such cases. Surely there are many other instances of a clinging to faith till the last possible moment, of a pathetic longing for faith and a realization that faith is life's greatest treasure. There is no proud defiance on the part of such men, but rather a reluctant yielding to an unwished-for pressure.

Moreover, may there not be much more pride on the part of those who set themselves up as judges of their fellow Catholics, who usurp the teaching authority of the Church, who recklessly dogmatize and add to the deposit of faith? Of the two prides, I am inclined to think that the heresy-hunter's is the more dangerous and the more sinful. For whatever pride the "little ones" may have concerns only themselves. They are not trying to force their opinions on others. But the heresy-hunter's pride is mainly directed against other people. It enrages him that others will not submit to his *ipse dixit.* And in his injured pride he hurls anathemas at them. He sets himself up not only as his own guide, but as the guide of all others.

Judge not that thou mayest not be judged is a terrible warning. And I suspect that the "little ones" who just barely keep on believing are less likely to come under this condemnation than the "big ones". They are not judging others. They are content to walk with the Church's infallible teaching. And if they do not go beyond this teaching, neither do they judge those who do go beyond it. All they desire is to be left alone. Whereas the "big ones" are constantly judging others. Any one who does not agree with them is adjudged a heretic. It would be well for them to remember that it is possible to be a heretic by believing too much, as well as by believing too little; by being too strict, as well as by being too lax.

Those of big faith ought to remember that it is possible to be guilty of rash judgment by accusing one of heresy, or of a tendency to heresy, just as well as by accusing one of theft or of adultery. To avoid such rash judgments, the "big ones" ought to be sure of two things before speaking. The first is, to know accurately just what the other party really holds. There should be no going on hearsay, no fourth-hand evidence. Only the man's own statements can justify any such serious charge as being unsafe, dangerous, heretical.

But assuming that the man's own statements are known, it is quite possible to be too hasty in jumping to conclusions. Human language is not a perfect means of expressing thought. Usually statements can be interpreted in more than one way. Even the very carefully thought-out decrees of the Church are often interpreted in different ways by different theologians. And therefore Christian charity urges that a man be given the

benefit of the doubt. There should be no eagerness to convict another of failing in faith. Surely here, just as well as in our civil courts, a man should be innocent until he is proved guilty.

This same imperfection of human language is at the basis of the other point that should be remembered by the smellers-out of heresy — to be absolutely sure of what the Church teaches, or does not teach. One's own inclinations and preferences should not be raised to the dignity of *ex cathedra* pronouncements. It is not always the more rigid interpretation that finally prevails on the Church. Tertullian's views on Baptism by heretics is an example that should be kept in mind and well pondered.

Moreover, self-constituted inquisitors should remember that a man's reputation for orthodoxy is just as precious as his reputation for honesty. Consequently, there is the same obligation to make restitution if one has wrongfully accused another of being unorthodox. It goes against one's pride to make the restitution, but the obligation is there. And even with the best will in the world, it will be a difficult thing to make restitution. There is a deal of truth in the saying, give a dog a bad name and hang him.

Every time I read the lessons for the feast of Saints Cyril and Methodius, I wonder how much even Rome can make up for the injury done by the smellers-out of heresy. Rome vindicated these Saints against the charges of the heresy-hunters. But the work of these apostles had been stopped at least temporarily, and who knows how much suspicion clung to them even after the highest authority in the Church had exonerated them?

Then, too, no one can calculate how much the Church suffers through the damper put on men who otherwise would have accomplished great things. It takes the heroism of saints like Cyril and Methodius to face such attacks. Lesser men take the easier course of retiring into a shell, and, by doing nothing, avoid all chance of being suspected. The field is left to the loud-mouthed one-hundred-percenters, who shout their own orthodoxy from the housetops and browbeat everyone else.

There is really only one sound rule — to follow the Church. Christian humility dictates that we do not trust in our own

infallibility; Christian faith implies that we should not force on others what the Church does not vouch for; and Christian charity demands that we should not judge others because they do not see eye to eye with us on matters that are not of faith. It is a terrible thing to rob a child of its innocence by scandalizing it; it is a terrible thing to rob a simple-minded, uneducated man of his faith; but it is just as terrible to rob an intelligent, well-educated man of his faith. It is for these latter that I plead against the recklessness of those of big faith.

When there is no sympathy for these educated people of little faith, when all their thinking is called intellectual pride, when they are attacked and nagged and browbeaten until they leave the Church, we are indeed in a bad way. Yet there are indications of this attitude on the part of some. May God forgive them, for they know not what they do. They think that they are serving God. But they have not the sympathy and charity that Christ said was the fulfilling of the Law and the Prophets; that Saint Paul described so beautifully in Corinthians; that Saint John comes back to again and again in his Epistles.

May we not apply to these self-constituted inquisitors and smellers-out of heresy, who are the occasion of scandal to so many of little faith, the words of Christ: "And whosoever shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in Me; it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea".[3]

I am afraid that the one of big faith to-day would have given the Apostle Thomas short shrift when he asked for proof of Christ's resurrection; that they would have let Peter sink when his faith failed him; that they would never have stilled the tempest when the Apostles, because they were men of little faith, were fearful.

Fortunately, we have Christ's example as to how those of little faith are to be treated. He loved them, He sympathized with them, He chose them to be his Apostles, one may even say that He humored them. Christ stilled the tempest, He raised Peter when he was sinking, He let Thomas put his hand into the spear wound of His side. Doubtless they are blessed who find faith easy, who can believe even if they have not seen.

[3] Mark, 9:41.

But hope also is a virtue, and charity is the greatest of all. May we not hope, therefore, that those of little faith to-day may yet be as pleasing to God as doubting Thomas, as blundering Peter? Should we not love them with the same tender, forgiving sympathy that Christ showed for His Apostles, whom He called men of little faith,[4] and who, He said, had not faith equal to a grain of mustard seed.?[5]

J. ELLIOT ROSS, C.S.P.

New York City.

[4] Matthew, 8:26.
[5] Luke, 17:6.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENTS.

Qu. 1. Mary and John, practical Catholics, are about to marry. Both hold salaried positions. They make the following agreement. The wife will continue to work. Birth control will be practised for five years, the time needed to save enough to purchase a home. At the end of that time, when economically secure, they will have children.

Is the marriage under such an agreement, valid?

2. Ida and James are about to marry. They are practical Catholics. They agree to have two children and no more and to resort to birth control for that purpose.

Is such a marriage valid?

3. Are such ante-nuptial agreements frequent?

4. To what extent is it advisable to set forth, in preaching or other public instruction, the full truth of moral and canon law concerning the bearing of such agreements upon the validity of marriage.

I am a missionary. Cases of the kind mentioned do occur. I find a variety of opinion concerning the validity of these marriages, and I know that priests disagree as to the wisdom of preaching much about them. If the REVIEW will go into the matter thoroughly, a great service will be rendered, not only to missionaries and other preachers, but also to all confessors.

C. D.

1 & 2. Canon 1086 § 2 states: "At si alterutra vel utraque pars positivo voluntatis actu excludit . . . omne ius ad coniugalem actum, . . . invalide contrahit." This canon gives the key to the solution of both questions 1 and 2. For the answer to them will depend upon the nature of the prenuptial agreement.

If before or at the time of their marriage the parties stipulate that they *do not give* but rather *deny* each other the mutual

right to that use of marriage which of its nature is destined for the procreation of children, and if that agreement is such that they deny each other *for the whole time of their life* the right to those acts: that agreement is contrary to the substance of marriage and as a result the marriage entered into with such a stipulation is certainly invalid. The words of Canon 1086 § 2, quoted above, settle that point beyond any doubt.

However, in the two questions the agreement inquired about does not absolutely and for the whole time of married life exclude all use of marriage for its proper ends, but only limits that use either as to time or to the number of children to be begotten. Presupposing that that limitation signifies that the parties *intend not to transfer* the mutual *rights and obligations* of marriage except within the limits of their stipulation, it would seem that even such a limitation would vitiate the consent, since the *rights* mutually given and received are *intended* not to be permanent and thus the agreement seems to destroy the consent by which according to Canon 1081 § 2 the *perpetual* right is mutually transferred. This is the view of most of the authors who touch upon this point explicitly.[1]

The only difficulty against this opinion is found in the word "omne" of Canon 1086 § 2, which would seem to declare that the marriage would only then be invalid, if the agreement (or also the one party's express intention) positively excluded *all* right to the proper use of marriage.[2]

Nevertheless, Vlaming, who explicitly faces this difficulty, concludes that a restriction of the marriage rights would render the marriage invalid.[3]

This view would seem to be correct. For not only a total denial of the right to that use of marriage for which marriage was instituted, but even a restriction of that right as to time, frequency, etc., appears to destroy the perpetuity of the rights mutually transferred. Therefore, if by the agreements referred to in questions 1 and 2 the *right* to the proper use of marriage is meant to be limited as to time or as to the number of children, the marriage would seem to be invalid.

[1] Cappello, *De Sacramentis,* Turin, 1923, III, n. 598, 3; n. 631, 3-5; Chelodi, *Ius Matrimoniale,* Trent, 1921, n. 116 and p. 135, note 5; Farrugia, *De Matrimonio,* Turin, 1924, n. 33, D, 1, b); Noldin, *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* III, *De Sacramentis,* 17. ed., Innsbruck, 1925, n. 631, 1. a.

[2] Cerato, *Matrimonium,* 3. ed., Padua, 1920, n. 82, 3.

[3] *Praelectiones Iuris Matrimonii,* 3. ed., Bussum, 1921, n. 547.

On the other hand, if the "agreement" made at the time of marriage implies no more than the intention to abuse the rights of marriage which they mutually give and accept: then this evil intention, sinful though it be, does not invalidate the marriage.

Which of these two "agreements" is it that young people who enter upon marriage with such an "understanding" make? Speaking in general, it will usually be no more than the evil intention of defiling their marriage-bed. For on the one hand, they scarcely grasp those distinctions; on the other hand, all or nearly all intend a real marriage, so that at most they intend merely to violate their marriage vows by mutual sin. Only in rare instances will their intention entirely deny or even restrict their mutual rights and obligations.

It will not be out of place to state one further point. After such marriages have failed, as frequently they must, what proofs are necessary in order that the parties who have entered upon marriage with an "agreement" which excludes either entirely or partially the mutual rights to the marriage act, can prove the invalidity of their marriage? The word of the parties themselves will never suffice. If the agreement had been drawn up in writing, this might suffice, provided the genuineness of the document were established. If witnesses to the agreement can be obtained, their testimony could be admitted. But, as is readily recognized, direct proof of such an agreement is scarcely ever obtainable. Indirect evidence, such as is admitted to prove non-consummation of a marriage, might be accepted. But unless whatever evidence produced is convincing beyond doubt, the agreement must be considered a mere evil intention of desecrating marriage and the marriage must be presumed valid.

3. How frequent such prenuptial agreements are among Catholics it is impossible to determine. But from statements made by various persons, including even the parties to marriages themselves, as well as from the observation that so many recent marriages of Catholics produce no children at all or at most a very limited number, one is not unwarranted in concluding that before marriage quite a number of Catholic young people, too, make such agreements at least to violate their sacred duties in the married state.

4. Beyond a doubt we may congratulate ourselves that the great majority of our Catholic marriages are not contaminated with the cancerous vice of birth control that is eating at the vitals of society to-day. Nevertheless it will not profit us to play the ostrich's game and conceal from ourselves the fact that contraceptive practices are spreading among Catholics and that great inroads toward this vice are being made among our young people who, not infrequently before marriage, it would seem, come to an "understanding" or even "agreement" as to how many children, if any, they will have. For though it is impossible to determine the proportions that such "agreements" have reached, it cannot be denied that they are made all too frequently.

But is it advisable to broach this subject before our young people? It is not at all advisable to discuss publicly the question whether and in how far such prenuptial "agreements" invalidate a marriage. For it is scarcely to be doubted that most of those agreements imply only the evil intention of violating the obligations of marriage. It will be extremely rare that the agreement withholds the right to the marriage act. An invalid marriage on this score will, therefore, be so extremely rare that it would be a useless expenditure of energy to enter into this question publicly, not to say anything of the great danger of creating a misunderstanding of this somewhat intricate question. Perhaps the net result of such information would be the invitation which unhappily married persons would take to propose their cases as coming under this head. Finally, if individuals will not be deterred from such prenuptial agreements because they are wrong and even before marriage sin against this sacrament, few of them will be deterred from such agreements because they expose the sacrament to the danger of invalidity—which danger is, however, not nearly so often present as some priests seem to suppose.

On the other hand there can be no doubt but that the Church in this country must face this problem in the lives of our young people. Continued silence is ill-timed. Our secular magazines are teeming with discussions of the topic of birth control and, what is worse, our Catholic young people are imbibing the false maxims of materialistic "reformers" of marriage who have long ago lost all conception of Christian marriage.

Some will, indeed, say we cannot drag such a topic before a Catholic audience lest we contribute to the spread of the knowledge of this vice. A most specious argument. Those who come in close contact with our Catholic young people are forced to the sad admission that even these latter not only have already acquired a quite thorough knowledge of the evil practices of birth control, but also that not a few have already set their minds on that practice.

Those who oppose discussing this phase of the question will appeal to the words of the Apostle and allege that this is one of those sins that ought not even to be named among Christians. True enough. But despite all that, did the Apostle himself close his eyes to facts and pass over in silence what ought not so much as to have been mentioned among his neophytes? Let the objectors read Rom. 1: 24-28; I Cor. 6: 9, 10, 15, 16, 18; 10: 8; Gal. 5: 16, 17, 19, 21; Eph. 5: 3-5; Col. 3: 5, 6; I Thess. 4: 3-5. In the face of such bold, outspoken, unequivocal speech one dares not hide behind the Apostle in shirking the duty of enlightening and guiding our young people, lest they be betrayed while we stand idly by.

There can, therefore, be no doubt that all who are interested in preserving the sanctity of chaste marriage must be prepared to take up the cudgels against an enemy that is already at our very door. It may not be advisable to discuss this subject before a mixed congregation. However, numerous occasions present themselves where this subject can openly and plainly and withal decently be dealt with. To mention but a few: this topic can very properly be treated in conferences given to the several branches of Sodalities, of the III Order, the Holy Name Society, and the like, where young people approaching marriageable age are present according to sexes. Perhaps some pastors may be averse to taking up this subject personally and in some instances it may not be advisable for them to do so. If they will invite competent speakers on extraordinary occasions and herald their coming by prudent "advertising", one or the other conference on this subject will produce abundant results. Then again at missions a sermon for the several individual states of life presents a very excellent opportunity. Then there are lay retreats which are gaining in attendance: provided a proper division as to sexes and age is made, they

offer very extraordinary opportunities in this regard. Again, priests, brothers, and sisters, gifted with tact and prudence, can do worlds of good in private conversations. Then there is that special occasion for particular guidance which presents itself at that instruction which both canon law and sound pastoral theology oblige pastors to give those about to marry. And last but not least there is a wide field here for special literature adapted to the various degrees of education among our people.

THE IMMORALITY OF CONTRACEPTION.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

With the first eight and one-half pages of Doctor Mahoney's argument in the August issue of the REVIEW, I am in almost entire agreement. His statements concerning the ethical teaching of the Church, as compared with deductions from the natural law (p. 133), concerning the importance of showing (if possible) that birth prevention is intrinsically wrong (p. 134), concerning the practical weakness of the "perverted faculty" argument (p. 137), concerning the "ultimate reason" why the practice is immoral (p. 141), and concerning the difficulty of deriving an effective popular argument from the traditional ground upon which all sexual sins have been condemned by the moral theologians (p. 141)—all these I accept without qualification. But the argument presented in the last four pages of the article leaves me unconvinced.

All Catholic ethicians would, I assume, accept the proposition that contraception, like all other sins against chastity, is bad because it is "opposed to the good of a rational nature" (p. 141). How shall this phrase be interpreted? In the sense of consequences? Or in the sense of intrinsic badness? In the latter sense, answers Doctor Mahoney (p. 134), as do all the writers of treatises on moral theology. While I have consistently accepted and defended this view myself, I have never found it entirely free from difficulty. In the following paragraphs I shall note the most serious difficulty and suggest a provisional solution.

As Doctor Mahoney points out, contraception and all other sexual sins are pronounced "inordinate" and "disproportionate" because they aim at an end which nature intends to

be only a means, that is, pleasure. He adds, however, that married persons can always find some reason or fact (for example, relief from concupiscence or promotion of mutual love) which frees the conjugal act from the imputation of being sought for pleasure alone. One or other of these reasons is held sufficient to justify intercourse during that portion of the intramenstrual period when conception is improbable, or during pregnancy, when it is impossible, or in case one or both parties are sterile. Such intercourse remains morally blameless, even when avoidance of conception is deliberately desired.

The married couple that places positive obstacles in the way of nature, whether physiological, mechanical or chemical, can likewise correctly claim that they are not seeking pleasure alone. They may desire relief from concupiscence or the strengthening of mutual love. Why then, is their conduct immoral, while that of the couples considered in the last paragraph is morally blameless? Because they "defeat the primary end of marriage", answers Doctor Mahoney (p. 144). But the couple that deliberately restricts intercourse to a certain time in the intramenstrual period also attempts to defeat the primary end; yet this aim is not condemned by the moralists. Nor is its attainment construed as a moral wrong.

The usual reply of the moral theologians to this difficulty is that the persons who employ birth-prevention devices accomplish the defeat of the primary end of marriage through positive acts which thwart the processes of nature, rather than through mere selection of times and circumstances. The obvious rejoinder is that this the "perverted faculty" argument, which, as Doctor Mahoney rightly points out, seems to be greatly weakened through the rejection by several theologians of the parallel argument against lying.

It seems to me, then, that the general argument for the intrinsic immorality of all sexual sin is quite as weak in theory as it is likely to prove in practice. And its theoretical defects apply, obviously, to every other violation of chastity as clearly as to contraception. Why is fornication wrong? I do not recall having ever seen a well sustained argument for its immorality on intrinsic grounds. In an article in the *New York Review* (vol. II, p. 423) more than twenty years ago, I tried to find the intrinsic immorality of that act in "the subjection

of man's lower to his higher nature," in the assumption that the moral supremacy of man's higher faculties requires him to refrain from sexual satisfaction "until he has undertaken the burdens of self-control and self-denial involved in the marital union". As an "intrinsic" argument this consideration does not seem to me now to have as much cogency as I attached to it in 1907.

Nor is the argument for the universal immorality of sexual offences altogether satisfying when it is based upon considerations of consequences. So far as I have been able to observe, this is the argument commonly urged against fornication. When St. Thomas discusses the question, "Utrum fornicatio simplex sit peccatum mortale," his affirmative answer is based upon the injury resulting to the offspring (2^a 2^{ae}, Q. 154, A. 2). At the end of the article, he considers the objection that in some such cases the father might make sufficient provision for the welfare of the child; but his reply is scarcely conclusive: That which falls under the determination of law must be judged according to what ordinarily happens, not according to exceptional cases. While this consideration is to a considerable extent valid for positive law, it is far from convincing as applied to the natural law. Many actions are morally lawful, even though they fall under a general category of sins. They are given a special classification in conformity with their special nature or circumstances. It would seem that the same treatment should be accorded to the irregular sexual intercourse which involves no evil consequences to children, as in the case of sterility; and likewise to birth prevention in certain restricted cases, say, when the life or health of the wife would be endangered by pregnancy.

Nevertheless, I would raise the question whether an argument from consequences cannot be effectively drawn against birth prevention, as against every other recognized form of sexual sin, even in exceptional situations. And I would suggest an affirmative answer, provided that the argument takes into account not only direct but indirect consequences. In certain rarely occurring situations contraception can probably take place without any direct evil results to the individuals or to society. But the baneful indirect effects are manifest. No community which accepts this practice as morally lawful in

exceptional conditions will long restrict it to those conditions, no matter how carefully the latter may be defined by persons assuming to speak authoritatively. If the definition of lawful use were so framed, as some physicians have suggested, as to cover only cases of ill health, it would receive wider extension from all persons who believed their situations to be equally urgent and "deserving"; for example, on account of domestic friction, poverty, the desire to improve the standard of living, the demands of "social" duties, the inconvenience of child-bearing and the disagreeable consequences when the parties are unmarried. Hence, there is no socially safe middle ground between complete prohibition of birth prevention and such general addiction to the practice as will inevitably bring about a declining population and a profound deterioration of social and individual character and competence.

Because of these indirect results the practice is forbidden by the moral law in every case. It is "utterly opposed to the good of a rational nature". The individual whose case is exceptional may plead that if birth prevention were restricted to situations such as his there would be no evil results, but he must recognize that he is supposing an impossibility. Therefore he must forego the practice in the interest of the human race. And this self-denial is reasonably imposed upon him as a moral obligation.

The moral principle underlying the foregoing argument is met with more than once in our manuals of moral theology. Actions not grave in themselves are forbidden, under pain of mortal sin, on the ground that acceptance of them as only venial would encourage such frequent commission as to bring about a grave amount of moral disorder. If consequences of this sort may make an otherwise venial sin mortal, may they not render an otherwise justifiable action morally unlawful?

Whatever may be the correct statement of the relation between birth prevention and the natural law, we Catholics should, as Doctor Mahoney points out, rejoice that we have the divinely inspired guidance of the Church. This is only one of many moral problems which reason is or ought to be capable of solving, but which have been more promptly and more authoritatively solved by the voice of Revelation.

JOHN A. RYAN.

Catholic University of America.

RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IN CONVENT CHAPELS.

Qu. When I was an assistant in a rather large city parish, it was deemed necessary by the pastor, that we have two Masses in the church daily, because of the goodly number who attended. There were about twenty sisters teaching there, and it was also considered very beneficial for them to have the Blessed Sacrament in their chapel. Therefore every two weeks it was my duty to carry the Blessed Sacrament from the church to the chapel, where the sisters received Communion each morning.

At present I am the pastor of a fairly large parish, where we have a school and teaching sisters. We have to build an addition to the convent, and have planned to add a chapel also. The sisters have always received Communion in the church, but would like to have the Blessed Sacrament in their own chapel. They are very reasonable, but the mother superior of the order tells me that there will be many little visits made which now cannot be made, because of the inconvenience. Hence I would like to see them have the advantage of the Blessed Sacrament in their own chapel. But there are many daily attendants at Mass, who would have to miss Mass if I were to say Mass in the sisters' chapel even once in two weeks. In that case, is there any permission to be had, of carrying the Sacred Species to the chapel in the ciborium, for an increase of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, for it would increase the devotion of the sisters, but it would also seem that I should not deprive a number of people of hearing Mass even occasionally. Would you kindly tell me if it be possible for me to obtain permission to thus carry the Sacred Species?

Some say that we may carry the Blessed Sacrament out of the church only in solemn procession, in going to the sick and in case of fire. Would you kindly help us to solve our difficulty?

Resp. Obedience to God and His Church is better than all visits to the Blessed Sacrament. The laws of the Church concerning the reservation of the Blessed Eucharist are very strict, and the Ordinary is urged to be watchful of their observance. Exceptions are granted only by apostolic indult, and this rarely.

Too much laxity prevails in certain parts of the country in regard to the keeping of the Blessed Sacrament in the houses of religious. One can understand that nuns should desire the presence of the Holy Eucharist in the house, as it undoubtedly

would be the occasion of "many little visits which could not otherwise be made because of inconvenience"; but who will doubt that one visit made at the cost of some inconvenience is spiritually more profitable than "many little visits" made otherwise?

Naturally enough, sisters are not expected to know canon law better than priests and bishops, and, in a case like this, the pastor should discreetly inform the superior that much as he would desire to give satisfaction to the sisters, the law of the Church does not allow him to do so, unless all prescribed conditions are fulfilled. It is very unfortunate, a little scandalous, and is the cause of many later misunderstandings, that our good sisters are so frequently allowed to indulge in practices of piety wholly at variance with ecclesiastical discipline, for it makes it very difficult for a more learned or more observant pastor to interrupt a practice thus unduly authorized by his predecessor. He cannot do so without exposing the ignorance or carelessness of his brother priest, or without causing great inconvenience to the sisters who have to change a mode of life to which they have become accustomed.

To come to the case submitted, all the practices mentioned are condemned by the Church. First, it is not for the pastor to decide whether or not the Blessed Sacrament will be reserved in the convent chapel; this right exclusively belongs to the diocesan Ordinary. Moreover, ancient regulations, confirmed by the new Code of Canon Law (Can. 1265 § 1), do not allow the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in churches or chapels where Holy Mass is not said at least once a week. This condition is absolute, and where it cannot be fulfilled the bishop himself has not the power to permit the reservation of the Holy Eucharist.

In practice, therefore, if the sisters wish to have the Blessed Sacrament in their convent chapel, permission must first be obtained from the diocesan Ordinary, who alone, according to Canon 1265 § 1 n. 2, has the power to grant that favor. Then there must be a concurrence of good will both on the part of the priest and of the sisters. The priest must arrange to say Mass in the sisters' chapel at least once a week, on a day known to the people; and, on that day, the sisters must allow the parishioners who go to Mass daily to hear Mass in the

convent chapel instead of the parish church. In this manner, everybody being willing to suffer some little inconvenience, all desired advantages will be gained, and the law of the Church will be perfectly obeyed, to the glory of God and the edification of everyone concerned.

HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE OPERATION.

Qu. A very practical point has come under discussion with regard to the advisability of giving Holy Communion to a patient under the following conditions.

The patient is ready for a surgical operation in the morning, having either *local* or *general* anesthetic (usually general anesthetic). What period of time should elapse between receiving Holy Communion and time for operation? Nearly all of these patients are nervous and greatly upset. Furthermore, many are nauseated and vomit during the administration of the anesthetic.

A very competent doctor has given, as his opinion, that it is inadvisable to give Holy Communion at all on the morning of the operation. Others say that from three to four hours previous to the operation is a safe length of time. The first mentioned doctor is one whose work happens to be the administering of the anesthetic, and my curiosity hinges around an observation of his that the vomited contents of one patient's stomach was found to have undergone no change at all. The explanation of this is, as stated above, that the anxiety and nervous strain preceding the operation affect the digestive system, even to the extent of rendering it inactive. Doctors and myself would be very grateful to get your opinion.

Resp. Notwithstanding the facts and opinions given, the matter does not appear very impressive or problematical.

If the patient be normal, that is, neither nauseated nor vomiting before the administration of the anesthetic, Holy Communion an hour before the operation is amply and duly reverent. We mean by *operation,* the preparations, such as shaving, etc. These should in every case appreciably follow in time the administration of this sacrament.

In case of vomiting during the operation, and should the Sacred Species appear, then the rubrically prescribed reverential treatment fulfills all propriety.

A general practice of refusing Holy Communion would be unwarrantable. It would be distressing to the faithful.

Patients about to undergo operations face death mentally at least and have a right to the comfort and peace and the great spiritual fortification and grace of the Blessed Sacrament. *Sacramenta propter homines.*

Of course this is entirely a matter for the discretion of the chaplain or attending priest.

RETRACTION BY A MASON BEFORE RECONCILIATION.

Qu. Is it true that before reconciling a Mason it is necessary to secure from him a written retraction signed by himself and two witnesses?

Resp. The conditions under which one who has joined the Masons or other society of the same nature can be absolved from the excommunication which is reserved *simpliciter* to the Holy See, are succinctly enumerated in the faculty recently granted by the Sacred Penitentiary to local Ordinaries:

V. Absolvendi a censuris et poenis ecclesiasticis eos qui nomen dederint sectae massonicae aliisque eiusdem generis associationibus, quae contra ecclesiasticas vel legitimas civiles potestates machinantur; ita tamen ut a respectiva secta vel associatione omnino se separent eamque abiurent; denuncient, iuxta can. 2336 § 2, personas ecclesiasticas et religiosas, si quas eidem adscriptas noverint; libros, manuscripta ac signa eamdem respicientia, si qua retineant, in manus absolventis tradant, ad S. Officium quamprimum caute transmittenda aut saltem, si iustae gravesque causae id postulent, destruenda; iniuncta pro modo culparum gravi poenitentia salutari cum frequentatione sacramentalis confessionis et obligatione illata scandala reparandi.[1]

Presupposing that the confessor who would reconcile a Mason is duly authorized to absolve him from the censure, either in virtue of special delegation or in virtue of Canon 882 or 2254 in the respective circumstances, the priest must demand the fulfillment of all the conditions laid down in the above faculty, including an abjuration. However, generally speaking, a formal abjuration is not necessary; it suffices that he make the abjuration at least before the confessor.[2] This

[1] Hilling, *Codicis Juris Canonici Supplementum,* Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1925, pp. 51-52.

[2] S.C.S.Off., 3 August, 1898 — *C.I.C.Fontes,* IV, 1204.

must include the promise to sever all connexion with the sect; not to take part in any of its acts either in secret or in public; and to make no further contributions to it. Even in the presence of grave reasons the penitent cannot be permitted to retain a passive membership in a masonic sect except by leave of the Holy Office in an extraordinary case.[3]

BOYS CAMPING OVER WEEK-END WITHOUT MASS.

Qu. Accepting the views about Sunday Mass published some time ago in the REVIEW, may I ask whether or not a Catholic Boy Scout may go on Friday to camp to remain until Monday if no opportunity to attend Mass is given?

Resp. The boy in the case is still under parental authority. Except for this he would be as technically free as any emancipated adult.

The parents could lawfully consent to his going. As to the wisdom of allowing it, we can only say that depends on the character of parents and boy. Are they careless about attendance at Sunday Mass? Again it is conceivable that to refuse the lad might do more harm than good. Boys get quite agog over such jaunts, and the disappointment might finish his Mass-going when he is "on his own," or before it. Certainly a wise parent will try to make him see the importance of Mass over such a pleasure trip, and enable him to accept cheerfully a refusal. If the parent allows it for one reason or another, he should secure the right attitude on the part of the boy as to the regular Mass obligation.

If the parent only advises the boy not to go, it is difficult to see where the boy is at fault, as this is leaving the decision with the boy. The parent should really decide, and not be content with advising and showing displeasure if advice is not followed. This will do the boy no good.

Obviously, as a general principle a parent would not readily consent to such a thing, but would inculcate a sturdy regard for Sunday Mass attendance in a boy.

[3] Quigley, *Condemned Societies,* Washington, 1927, pp. 113-120.

ADOPTION OF PROTESTANT CHILDREN BY A CATHOLIC.

Qu. Anna, a Catholic, marries John, an Episcopalian. They have no children. John's friend, a Protestant, dies and leaves two children to his care. May Anna help in rearing the children in their Protestant faith, that condition having been made and accepted between the two men.

Resp. The Catholic wife apparently has no choice about the coming of the children into her home. She certainly may teach them what is sound doctrine, but not as professedly Protestant. Of course she should not teach them distinctively heretical doctrine as true or to be believed. She could see to their attendance at church, etc.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

Amongst the vanished pre-exilic scenes of Old Testament history, the site of Kiryath-(" Cariath "-) Sepher has always been an interesting subject of inquiry. Little enough is known of this ancient town, and the two parallel passages which explicitly name it are so precisely similar that with Jos. 15 : 15-17 before us we may pass over its repetition in Judges 1. 11-13. The record in either case is as follows:

> And he [Caleb] went up from thence against the inhabitants of Debir (now the name of Debir was formerly Kiryath-Sepher). And Caleb said: He that smiteth Kiryath-Sepher and taketh it, I will give him Acsah my daughter for a wife. And Othniel the son of Kenaz, the brother of Caleb, took it; and he gave him Acsah his daughter for a wife.

While these twin passages give Kiryath-Sepher its clearest place in history, there is one other incidental note of its approximate location. Josue 15 concludes with a complete geographical list of those Canaanite towns which fell to Judah's share, designating them in circuit as distinct groups situated successively " toward the border of Edom in the Negeb [southland] " (21), " in the Shephelah [coastal plain] " (33), " in the highland " (48), and " in the waste " (61). The " highland " is the region west and southwest of Jerusalem as far as " the Shephelah ". The group ascribed to this last closes with the Philistine centers of Ashdod (the New Testament Azotus) and Gaza; and as the historian turns to climb " the highlands " (48-49), the list of its group begins with " Shamir and Yattir and Sokoh and Dannah and Kiryath-Sannah, that is, Debir ". But the last-named original of Debir must be Kiryath-Sepher, as above; and in fact the writing " Sannah ", probably a dittography of the preceding " Dannah ", seems to be subsequent to the text employed by the LXX, which here, as in both the longer parallel passages, instead of reproducing the former name of Debir, simply translates it as πόλις γραμμάτων. Hence Kiryath-Sepher, in the circuit described by this geographical list, would have lain somewhere in the highlands of south-

western Judah not far from their descent to the coastal plain opposite Gaza. Moreover, in the longer parallel passages, the last scene of conquest from which Caleb "went up against the inhabitants of Debir" is no other than Hebron, whose identity with the present El-Halil, about twenty miles south-by-southwest from Jerusalem, is regarded as settled. Probably, therefore, Kiryath-Sepher lay not far west or southwest from Hebron.

In this general locality we have therefore to seek a Canaanite center of evident strength and importance at the time of the Hebrew invasion, taken by Judah during the lifetime of Caleb, Josue's contemporary, and never appearing in post-exilic annals. From the Massoretic writing Kiryath-Sepher, together with the LXX's rendering πόλις γραμμάτων, the original Canaanite name has generally been taken to mean "Town of a Book" or "of Writing". Hence the hope of discovering some literary remains has added to the interest of the question of Kiryath-Sepher's identity. Up to the present, however, solutions have been merely conjectural. Perhaps the opinion most commonly advanced has been that which favors the modern Ḍahariyeh,[1] about twelve miles southwest of Hebron, as the probable site of Kiryath-Sepher. But in addition to difficulties besetting the argument from the name itself, it is much more significant that no remains as yet found at Ḍahariyeh can be said to antedate the Roman period,—an insuperable obstacle to its identification with Kiryath-Sepher.

A far more probable suggestion is now advanced in consequence of some recent excavations, and it has been my privilege to hear its announcement by the investigator himself. On 14 June, at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, a meeting of the Palestine Oriental Society exchanged its customary order of business for an address by Dr. W. F. Albright, then Director of the American School. His subject was "The Recent Excavations at Tel Beit-Mirsim". Quite frankly, although with the moderation due to an announcement of such significance, the lecturer advocated as strongly probable the view that the scene of his recent labors

[1] Guthe's *Bibelatlas*, 2d edition (1926), on Map 20 (B 6), has even charted Ḍahariyeh with the alternate name "Debir". See also Hagen's *Atlas Biblicus*, alphabetical index, under name "Dabir", p. 39.

was none other than the site of Kiryath-Sepher. So interesting in themselves and so persuasive in their evidential force were the facts presented by Dr. Albright within little more than an hour's space, that I have requested his permission to present a sketch of them here. It need hardly be observed that this permission, promptly and generously granted, neither makes Dr. Albright responsible for possible inaccuracies in the present account, nor prejudices any authentic report of his findings which may hereafter appear.

The " tel " or mound of Beit-Mirsim has borrowed the name of an adjacent village, of Aramaic origin and occupied since the Byzantine period. It stands on a hill-slope about as far (twelve miles) from Hebron as Ḍahariyeh itself, but southwest-by-west of the former point and four or five miles northwest of the latter. In its annual expedition of 1924 the American School of Archaeology had observed the possible importance of this site as a source of data for Palestinian archaeology. The surface remains of the tel betrayed no traces of occupation subsequent to the Babylonian Exile. Moreover, its comparatively small extent offered a sphere within which the undivided personal attention of a competent director might ensure the consistent progress of investigation along a single line, and free from the complicated organization and variety of concurrent operations inevitable in the exploration of larger sites. The possibility, however, of realizing these hopes is ascribed by Dr. Albright to the generous coöperation of Dr. M. G. Kyle, President of Xenia Theological Seminary, whose assistance made it possible to begin excavations in the same season of 1924. The sum of the results now announced includes the operations of the present year, which closed on 4 June, 1928.

Up to the present, Dr. Albright and his collaborators have uncovered six successive levels of occupation on this comparatively limited site. Most fortunately the criteria of their distinction have not proved so obscure as is often the case, where successive levels of occupation may blend and interpenetrate until their exact limits become largely matter of conjecture. At Tel Beit-Mirsim the levels are clearly differentiated by intervening layers of ash, due to successive destructions by fire. Practically the only source of interpenetration lies in the occur-

rence of pits sunk for the storage of grain; and even in these cases, if the shaft of the pit can be traced to its original opening, the level to which its contents belong is thus determined. A brief table of these levels as dated by their remains may be presented in the order of their antiquity, the reverse of their relative vertical positions:

Level F: End of Early Bronze Age.
" E: Early Middle Bronze Age.
" D: 17th to 15th Centuries B. C.
" C: 14th to 13th Centuries B. C.
" B: 12th to 10th Centuries B. C.
" A: 9th to late 7th or early 6th Centuries B. C.

Of the two lowest and most ancient levels (F and E), especially of the first, it will suffice to say at once that only enough has been uncovered to establish their relative age beyond serious doubt. Together they embrace a lapse of time from before the migration of Abraham into Palestine down to about the period of his descendants' recorded settlement in Egypt. Of the subsequent and higher levels, however, much fuller information is available.

First among its general conclusions, this evidence tends to show a marked difference in the number of inhabitants respectively possessed by the towns that succeeded one another in the history of this site. On the oldest of these last four levels (D) the close proximity of the houses, two of which at times own a common partition, tells the story of a very populous town within a period extending roughly from 1600 to 1400 B. C. Within the next two higher levels (C. and B.) the caes is otherwise, the general evidence pointing to a sparser settlement of the site during these two successive but distinct periods. Finally, in A, the uppermost and latest level of occupation, a high rate of population is once more indicated. Putting these fluctuations approximately into their successive settings in history as otherwise revealed by the character of the remains, we find (D) a flourishing community inhabiting this site just subsequent to the time of the sojourn of the Hebrew patriarchs in Palestine, with a typically Canaanitic civilization revealed by its relics. Next (C) we find a more sparsely settled town at just about the period covered by the official correspondence of Tel el-Amarna. This suggests that the inhabitants shared the consequences of

the general violence and turbulence of that period, when Egypt's relaxing hold upon Palestine had left it divided tribe against tribe and town against town till its population became decimated by ceaseless raids. The next higher level (B) repeats the tale of scanty population, but now throughout a period about contemporaneous with that of the Judges, Samuel, Saul and David.[2] This was a time of constant struggle between the Hebrew invader and the various indigenous tribes; its vicissitudes of triumph and defeat crowd the pages of the Judges and Samuel, suggesting that the occupants of a small and exposed position between Hebron and the Philistine territory, to whichever side they belonged, would enjoy scant opportunity for peaceful thrift and multiplication. Finally (A), a populous and busy town with a well-defined Israelitish type of culture crowns the ruins of its predecessors during the last period of the site's occupation, beginning about the end of Solomon's reign and ending with the first stages of Neo-Babylonian conquest.

It has been said that the independent dating of these periods of fluctuation rests upon their successive types of culture. These are instructive in themselves. Beginning with Period D, approximately 1600-1400, the remains of human industry, especially ceramic, show but few traces of Egyptian influence upon a culture predominantly Canaanitic. Whereas in the next period, C, the presence of Egyptian ideals and methods is strongly marked. To mention some comparative details: from the D level was recovered a small stele representing a serpent-divinity of purely Canaanitic type, though of an identity hitherto unknown. From this same level, again, there are figurines of the popular female divinity already familiar in the archaeology of Canaan, but little if at all modified by Egyptian characteristics. On the contrary, the figurines of this same class recovered from level C are thoroughly Egyptianized, wearing the conventional hat or "wig" and displaying the usual Egyptian characteristics. This serves to establish the general prevalence of Egyptian influence in Period C; and if at the same time the decline in population, already remarked as

[2] It will be observed that to place this epoch of Hebrew history at a time "from the 12th to the 10th centuries" is to adopt the later of the two currently admitted dates of the Exodus and the occupation of Palestine by the Hebrews. This point, however, was not emphasized by the lecturer, even as receiving confirmation from the results here announced.

a feature of the same period, may be ascribed to any general condition of the time, the period of the Tel el-Amarna Letters, when Egyptian power once thoroughly organized was already on the wane in Palestine, is the only time to which the occupation of Level C can be assigned. Passing upward thence to Level B, the type of culture changes again, and a civilization once more appears which has little or no affinity with that of contemporary Egypt, yet is not identical with that of ancient Canaan, and may therefore as aptly be considered early Israelite. And finally, in A, the uppermost level, everything is characteristically Judean.

A particularly interesting object belongs to this final stratum of occupation. It is the detached handle of an earthen jar, bearing in old Hebrew characters the inscription *'Elyaqim na 'ar Yokin.* The owner's possession of the same name with a late king of Judah does not help to establish his personal identity, but there can be little doubt that he inscribed himself *na 'ar,* or "servant" in some capacity, of that very "Joachin" who was overcome and led prisoner to Babylon by Nabuchodonosor "in the eighth year of his reign", or 597.[3] As to the identity of *Yokin* with the longer form (vocalized) *Y^{e}hoyakin,* it happens that this inscription confirms, and is confirmed by, an exactly parallel instance already believed to exemplify such a contraction. The probability that the vessel bearing the name of the unfortunate king perished (perhaps with its owner) in the final overthrow and destruction of the town, justifies the inference that the occupation of the site of Tel Beit-Mirsim came to an end with, or shortly before, the fall of Joachin himself in 597.

What can have been the name of this ancient town in Canaanite and early Hebrew times? Summing up in constructive form the outstanding data established by its exploration, we have the following facts. It stood in ancient times about twelve miles southwest from Hebron, near the decline of the Judean highlands to the Shephelah in the general vicinity of Gaza. To a conqueror of Hebron proceeding to push his operations thence, it would at least offer an important point of attack. In the 15th century it was occupied by a strong Canaanite community. During the ensuing period, corres-

[3] See 4 Kings 24: 12.

ponding to that of the Tel el-Amarna Letters, its culture was Egyptian and its population relatively sparse. At approximately 1200 B. C. it was destroyed and rebuilt by an invader quite other than Egyptian in ideals and pursuits, while it did not receive from him any notable increment in population. It rose once more to considerable numbers and prestige in the times of the rival Israelite monarchies; it perished for the last time just before the Babylonian exile of Judah, and its site has never since been inhabited. If this town was not the Kiryath-Sepher of the Canaanites and the Debir of their Hebrew conquerors, the record of its career shows a convergence of circumstantial evidence that would be hard to assign to any other spot known to the early history of Judea.

On the other hand, no positive objection to this identification has yet presented itself. It is true that nothing suggesting a "library" or any considerable literary activity has yet been discovered at Tel Beit-Mirsim. This circumstance would hardly offer insuperable difficulty, even if we adhered to the Massoretic reading Kiryath-Sepher. But the vocalization of the last word is far from certain, and the probability that it was originally Kiryath-Sōphēr, "Town of a Writer", or "Scribetown", suggests itself on independent grounds. For instance, an Egyptian inscription of the XIXth Dynasty shows the element *sfr,* in similar constructions, with the vowel-sign of U or O in its first syllable. On the other hand, Professor Chiera, of the University of Chicago, has found the actual name "Town of the Scribe" belonging to a settlement of northeastern Mesopotamia during the fifteenth century B. C. Hence the name of the Canaanite stronghold overthrown by Caleb may have been "formerly Kiryath-Sopher"; and if this be allowed of the original of Tel Beit-Mirsim, it will not be necessary to expect it to turn out a πόλις γραμμάτων, even though the further excavation of its more ancient levels should still hold some surprise in store.

* * *

In a former issue of these studies, nearly three years ago,[4] some attention was given to Hugo Grimme's much-discussed interpretation of the peculiar group of inscriptions discovered

[4] LXXIII, 6, December, pp. 637-641.

by Flinders Petrie at Serabit (Sinai), and to Schaumberger's criticism of some of Grimme's inferences from the so-called "Moses-inscription". In 1905 Petrie had discovered at the ancient turquoise-mines of Serabit more than 350 inscriptions, all of which were in a local form of Egyptian hieroglyphic except twelve fragments numbered 344 to 355. These last were in characters closely akin to the hieroglyphs, but unintelligible as Egyptian. Petrie's inference at the time, that the language was that of Semitic laborers and the characters proto-alphabetic rather than strictly pictorial, has furnished an acceptable working-hypothesis for subsequent attempts to decipher the writing. Several such efforts have been confined to one or two of the inscriptions, but three scholars, of whom Grimme was the latest, have treated them all. The latter's version, published in 1923, attracted the attention of the general public by ascribing one of the tablets to Moses in acknowledgment of his rescue from the Nile by the Egyptian princess Hatshepsut. All of the interpreters, however, had worked from photographic records, a method whose well-known uncertainty was acknowledged by Grimme himself; and Schaumberger, in a passage formerly quoted, voiced the sentiments of all in expressing the hope that the original inscriptions of Serabit might yet be made accessible.

The realization of this hope was announced in a lecture delivered in New York last Christmastide before a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, by Professor Butin, of the Catholic University. In the January number of the *Harvard Theological Review* the data were published in complete detail in two articles of great value. The first one, entitled "The Rediscovery of the Inscriptions", by Professors Kirsopp Lake and Robert P. Blake, of Harvard,[5] modestly recounts the great service performed by these two scholars and a few associates in searching out this collection of Petrie's discoveries and transporting its movable portions to the Museum at Cairo, where they can henceforth be examined as they are. The expedition also discovered a fragment of the same class not mentioned by Petrie, and two complete inscriptions carved within tunnels from which they could not be detached. The

[5] *Harvard Theological Review*, XXI, 1, January, 1928, pp. 1-8.

transportation of these stones through an almost impassable region under severe heat was a toilsome achievement, yet its authors are able to write:

> Thus all Petrie's fragments are now at Cairo except Gardiner's 355, and in addition there is a new fragment, which Professor Butin proposes to number 356. Similarly, the long inscription in Mine L is to receive the number 357, and the short one in Mine M that of 358. These last two of course remain at Serabit.

In Jerusalem the party submitted their photographs and transcriptions to Professor Butin, at that time acting Director of the American School of Oriental Research in this city. He first made a thorough study of these records, and then examined the originals in Cairo. An account of his method and conclusions constitutes the second of the articles already mentioned, under the title "The Decipherment and Significance of the Inscriptions".[6] The two articles are illustrated by an alphabetic table, fifteen photographs and fourteen schematic transcriptions. Grimme's renderings are seldom confirmed by Butin, but the very independence of the latter's version lends the greater value to his agreement with his predecessors on the general witness of these inscriptions to the origin of alphabetic writing. His article is really a complete monograph on the Serabit inscriptions; its erudition, patience and temperate critique invite confidence, and it should remain an indispensable contribution to the discussion of this subject. A brief synopsis of its main features may be of interest after a word of general introduction.

The employment of hieroglyphics, or pictorial symbols, to represent objects and actions was of the remotest antiquity in Egypt and long continued in use. Out of it later arose not only hieratics, or simplifications of the earlier hieroglyphs, but eventually an Egyptian alphabet. This last, however, had numerous signs, and not all of homogeneous phonetic value. In the mean time the Greeks had obtained from the Phoenicians an alphabet in the stricter sense—a series of characters each denoting a simple element of articulate utterance, and capable of representing any possible combination of such elements into syllables and words. The Phoenician

[6] Ibid., pp. 9-67.

alphabet, though not certainly the earliest in its familiar form, remains a typical and fairly ancient example of its class. This class—properly alphabetic and more homogeneous than the Egyptian product—is in fact Semitic.

In the further endeavor to discover the origin of the earliest types of this class, the collateral evolution of a freer Egyptian form of alphabet from the hieratics of Egypt would afford some presumption of a similar process on the Semitic side. But there is more than this to go upon. The letters of early Semitic alphabets were actually known by the names of common objects, while the initial consonant of each name was identical with the value of the corresponding letter. For instance, "beth" is the Semitic word for "house", and is also the name of a letter denoting the sound "b" with which this word begins. The principle of alphabetic origin which this naturally suggests is further confirmed: leaving the "square" characters of the later Phoenician and post-exilic Hebrew, and recurring to their cruder originals now known from many ancient sources, we find the earliest forms of these letters actually depicting in a crude way the objects by whose names the letters are known, or at least other objects whose names begin with the same consonant. It would be hard to account for all these facts unless the alphabetic letter, expressing only the value of a single consonant, once stood somehow or other for the objects whose name still adheres to it. This principle of "acrophony," while it has met with some opposition, remains as yet the most widely accepted explanation of the origin of strictly alphabetic signs. What was at first the picture of an object seems to have become the symbol of a single vocal element with which the name of that object began in the language of the writer. It is not too much to say that the most reasonable and plausible interpretations of the Serabit inscriptions hitherto produced have afforded positive support to this hypothesis, and that this is one of the chief values of their discovery.

Dr. Butin adopts from the outset the line of inquiry common to most of his predecessors. The characters under examination are too closely akin to the surrounding hieroglyphics to be independent of these in origin, and yet they cannot be read as expressing Egyptian words. They are therefore manifestly hieroglyphs which have acquired some other expressive value.

This established, it is natural in the first place to assume with Petrie [7] that a language employed by laborers in Egyptian mines in western Arabia, if not Egyptian, was probably Semitic. Secondly it may be assumed that the principle of acrophony will yield the most probable key to the values of the signs. But to apply known Semitic values to the characters of Serabit, a choice must first be made between the two geographical groups, northern and southern, which comprise the ancient Semitic alphabets hitherto known. Dr. Butin gives reasons for believing the northern group, which included the Phoenician, to be probably the more primitive, and the system of Serabit to be connected with its early stages, though not itself the very beginning of Semitic alphabetical script. The general plan of identification thus defined is admirably illustrated by a comparative table of four of the most ancient Semitic alphabets and one of the earliest forms of the Greek.

Dr. Butin proceeds to subject to detailed examination all of the characters which occur in the Serabit inscriptions, arranging them in the order common to Semitic alphabets, and discussing the constant value of each. The data applied to this inquiry are clearly stated and highly interesting. Next follows a thorough treatment of the question of the age of these inscriptions. Petrie and Grimme had placed them at about 1500 B. C. Sethe considered them earlier, belonging most probably to the Hyksos period (XVth and XVIth Dynasties, about 1700-1600), though possibly to the XIIIth or XIVth Dynasties (1788-1700). Butin, however, agrees with Gardiner in making them earlier still; in particular he would assign them to the reign of Amenemhat III, "about the year 1850 B. C., or a little later". This conclusion is chiefly based on external evidence; but the relative antiquity of the inscriptions appears in certain interesting internal characteristics, which at the same time seem to confirm the principle of acrophony. The forms of the letters are frequently quite suggestive of the objects denoted by the names later used for Semitic letters. On the other hand, however, they vary

[7] Lake and Blake (p. 2) attribute the first suggestion of a Semitic language to Gardiner, affirming that "Petrie himself offered no further suggestion as to the language of the inscriptions beyond stating that it was not Egyptian". Yet Petrie at the very first (*Researches in Sinai*, pp. 129-132) expressed the opinion that the workmen who had used these signs were of Syrian origin, which would at least seem to imply that he considered their inscriptions Semitic.

enough to suggest a time when the phonetic values were fixed, but the signs themselves not yet quite conventionalized. Some of the inscriptions read from side to side, others from top to bottom. Some of the signs have a constant position, while others may vary between vertical and horizontal, so long as they are distinctive enough to be unmistakable in either case. If such peculiarities may be regarded as more than merely local, they should place the script of Serabit at least among the oldest systems yet discovered. Besides, the mere fact that a confirmation of the earliest date yet computed for this collection, should be the consequence of the most thorough and favorable study hitherto bestowed upon it, is interesting in itself. It still further diminishes the credit of the onetime assumption of destructive criticism, that the production of written annals under the personal direction of Moses must be considered an anachronism.

Finally Dr. Butin supplies the reading, transcription, and probable word-division and translation of all the inscriptions. The last two elements are, of course, beset with uncertainties, which are frankly pointed out in every instance. The principles of morphology and syntax followed are in the main Phoenician. The translations thus arrived at make the inscriptions read as conventional specimens of their class,—prayers to the goddess of the industry, dedication-tablets, or records of signal events in the conduct of the mining operations. As regards these general characteristics Dr. Butin is in substantial accord with the previous translators, Eisler, Bruston and Grimme, though in detail all four scholars differ considerably. Butin, however, notes an additional circumstance of some interest. Notwithstanding frequent references in the inscriptions to this or that monument or object of piety, the group as a whole were originally found within a relatively limited space, instead of accompanying the objects or places to which they appear to refer. This suggests that the place of discovery was at or near a sort of workshop where the carving for the mines was commonly done, and that the fragments in our possession had been discarded on account of defects. If this inference is well founded, it may be the good fortune of future investigators to discover the accepted copies of these inscriptions *in situ*.

The "Moses-inscription" of Grimme, No. 349, was reproduced in full in our earlier notice.[8] Dr. Butin's version is as follows:

Translation: "M–SH, head of the stele-setters, has erected this libation (vase)—altar (?); arise, now, O Ba'alat ... the brother of the prince (of thy devotee) ... M–SH ... –SH ..."; *or* "I, T–Z, have appointed M–SH as head of the stele-setters; arise now ..." etc.

The only point of agreement seems to lie in the proper name whose consonants "M-SH" Grimme ventured to vocalize as "Mosheh", the Hebrew form of Moses. Of a "Yahu" or "Yaho" Dr. Butin finds no trace, nor any mention of Queen Hatshepsut, nor any such sentence as "thou hast taken me out of the Nile".

While Dr. Butin himself would be the last person to imagine that his renderings of the Serabit inscriptions, however careful and conscientious, could be more than fairly probable in the face of existing obscurities, his study conveys an impression of sounder judgment and more trustworthy conclusions than that of Grimme. When the former observes (in a footnote to page 34) that "Grimme has added a great deal to our knowledge and his merit should not be minimized", he is certainly right. Yet those inevitable errors of premature judgment which are but a part of the price of all progress, belong to a different category than conclusions of primary historical importance announced with confidence on foundations so uncertain as to afford little more than pretexts. Of the latter class, unfortunately, were Grimme's sweeping deductions[9] as to the origins of Hebrew worship from the sole and highly uncertain presence of "Yahu" in his reading of the last-mentioned inscription. To perpetuate the mere memory of mistakes would be ungenerous in the absence of compelling motive; but when an error that is really injurious loses its alleged support, the loss should not go unrecorded.

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.
Pontifical Biblical Institute, Jerusalem.

[8] December, 1925, p. 639.
[9] Ibid.; see also March, 1926, pp. 37-38.

Criticisms and Notes

THE LIFE OF UNION WITH GOD. By the Very Rev. Canon Auguste Saudreau. Translated from the third edition by E. J. Strickland. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Pp. 331.

The price of this book will unfortunately deter many from buying it. Yet it is a mine of information, dug out by years of patient research. After an introductory chapter on perfection and the prayer of the perfect, the author starts out to prove by quotations from spiritual writers down through the centuries that this loving union with God, the unitive way, is the usual crowning point of the spiritual life, a gift which the Holy Spirit normally grants to those who prepare themselves sufficiently by recollection, mortification, holy desires, and the practice of virtue. He begins with Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Athanasius, and the Greek Fathers; he takes up St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, Cassian, Venerable Bede and St. Peter Damian in the West; then he passes to St. Bernard, the Victorines, and the Ladder of the Cloister; then to the Scholastics (Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure and the Franciscan school); then Tauler, Suso, Gerson, St. Teresa, and St. John of the Cross. He describes the strong opposition to mysticism in sixteenth-century Spain, when such an outcry against the Illuminati arose that even orthodox writers had to keep quiet for a long time afterward or to protest against misinterpretations of their doctrines. Melchior Cano, the celebrated Dominican, was the leader in the opposition; not only outsiders but even Carmelites distrusted St. Teresa's mode of prayer. Father Colunga, O.P., says that in the beginning the Jesuits favored mysticism, but that soon they began to copy the general distrust of it, as can be seen from the prohibition issued by the General, Father Everard Mercurian. Some in the Society, however, maintained the earlier practice, as Blessed Alvarez, St. Francis Borgia, St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, Suarez, Venerable Luis de la Puente, Le Gaudier, Alvarez de Paz, Lallement, Surin, and Grou. Scaramelli, on the other hand, receives from the Abbé Saudreau this strong condemnation for opposing contemplation: "This writer enjoyed a repute truly inexplicable, for his importance does not exceed that of the third-rate authors."

The Abbé concludes by re-asserting the value and possibility of divine union for all; for all, that is, who practise strict recollection, severe self-denial, and constant prayer, since these are the indispensable conditions for obtaining this priceless gift.

LEX LEVITARUM. By the Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport. With the "Regula Pastoralis" of St. Gregory the Great. Benziger Brothers; New York. Pp. lvi + 349.

The *Regula Pastoralis*, a manual of spiritual and moral direction for pastors, written by Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604), is a book that never grows old. So likewise the commentary on some of its "more profound and fertile views and principles," prepared by Bishop Hedley over a quarter of a century ago for the particular benefit of advanced students in seminaries, seems to be a work which will endure. This reprint of the patristic classic together with its modern commentary will enable members of the clergy to replace previous editions which have become worn by constant use, and will make readily available for seminarians and junior priests one of the choicest volumes they can obtain. Neither the treatise of St. Gregory nor the commentary of Bishop Hedley, who has combined 'the wisdom of the fathers with the clear perception of present day needs,' requires introduction at this date. The *Regula Pastoralis* was the standard text book of the episcopate down through the centuries and exercised a deep influence upon the Western Church. Its solid thought and wise counsel are just as objective and impressive today as they were in the time of the great Benedictine Pontiff. In the first division, we have a sympathetic and balanced discussion of the qualifications of those who aspire to the pastoral office; in the second, we learn how the pastor would order his life from the spiritual point of view; in the third, we possess a rich treasure of admonitions on suiting the pastoral teaching to different classes of people; and in the fourth, we are reminded that the preacher must often return upon himself by humility, lest his very virtues prove his ruin. The commentary of Bishop Hedley expands a number of carefully chosen points from the *Regula Pastoralis*, as a guide for those who labor to prepare intellect, will, and heart for the responsibilities of the pastoral charge.

COMMENTAIRE FRANCAIS LITTERAL DE LA SOMME THEOLOGIQUE DE SAINT THOMAS D'AQUIN. Par le Père Thomas Pègues, O.P. T. XVII: Les Sacrements: Bapteme-Confirmation. 1927. T. XVII: Les Sacrements: L'Eucharistie. 1928. Pierre Téqui, Paris.

"By accurate and frequent instruction on the sacraments the faithful will be enabled to approach worthily and with salutary effect these inestimable and most holy institutions; and the priests will not

depart from the rule laid down in the divine prohibition: '*Give not that which is holy to dogs: neither cast ye your pearls before swine*' (Matt. 7:6)." These words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent[1] prove the importance of all well-written treatises on the sacraments, those sensible objects and observances which, by divine institution, have the power not only of signifying, but also of effecting holiness and righteousness.

The history of our growth in the knowledge of the sacraments is very interesting and instructive. "Signs of sacred things" was a definition accepted for centuries, but the Church knew always that the various observances and ceremonies included in that broad definition were not all of equal value. When the famous Peter Lombard (d. 1164) formulated an accurate definition of sacraments properly so called[2] the formula was acclaimed at once; the scholastics perfected and explained it: the theological world from that day forward continued to proclaim that sacraments properly so called were visible ceremonies instituted by Christ to signify grace and to effect interior sanctification in the souls of men.

"*Signum rei sacrae in quantum est sanctificans homines*" was the final definition of a sacrament given by Saint Thomas.[3] The thirteenth century saw the climax of scientific Sacramental Theology. The Councils of Florence and Trent sanctioned and quasi-consecrated many expressions of the scholastic theologians. The *rationale* of the sacraments scarcely could be more fully developed: there remained for future writers nothing but historical settings, liturgical explanations and devotional applications.

Continuing his learned translation and commentary on the Summa, Father Pègues, always an ardent and enthusiastic Thomist, lucidly and forcibly expounds Saint Thomas' doctrine on the Sacraments in general, Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist, the last named being treated in a special volume. Those who venture to select any one tract as the most beautiful in the Summa of Saint Thomas are very much inclined to select his treatise on the Eucharist. His whole mind, heart and soul seem to have been put into the questions pertaining to the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. They are the centre of the liturgy of the Church: they are as a centre around which his life revolved.[4]

Hence it is not surprising, considering the history of the man, the scholar and the saint, that in this tract we have the most remarkable

[1] Fr. McHugh-Callan, p. 141.

[2] Lib. IV Sent., D.I.

[3] 3, Qu. 60, A. 2.

[4] See 3, Qu. 65, A. 3: Qu. 73, A. 2, s.c., A. 3, c. & ad. 1; A. 4: Qu. 79, A. 1. cfr. Catech. Trid., de Euchar., n. 4, n. 18.

combination of deep piety and theological accuracy that ever came from the pen of an uninspired author—if, indeed, in this work of love he did not have the help of special illumination. It is worthy of note that the declarations of the Council of Trent on the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are given almost in the same words used by Saint Thomas in expressing those central truths of our faith.[5] Not content with a statement and exposition of Catholic teaching, the Angelic Doctor piously and patiently explains the words and ceremonies used in Eucharistic services. "Since the whole mystery of our salvation is comprised in this sacrament, therefore it is performed with greater solemnity than the other sacraments" (3, qu. 83, A. 4). The last Question on this great sacrament is a mine of liturgical information and an edifying chapter of Eucharistic piety.

Theologians will find in Father Pègues' Commentary on this Question a brief but learned discussion on the sacrifice of the Mass. The one great sacrifice of the New Law was offered on Calvary. "Christ by His own blood entered once in the holy of holies, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9: 12). How the Last Supper and the Mass are one with the oblation made on Calvary, and how they differ, is explained in the old traditional way (the explanation being taken from Saint Thomas) to the exclusion of new theories recently proposed by some learned and holy writers.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POCKETBOOK. By the Reverend Herman J. Heuser, D.D. P. J. Kenedy & Sons; New York. Pp. 291. 1928.

This volume reproduces a series of chapters on clerical life and relations which were published orginally in the REVIEW. Instead of taking the direct way of comment and counsel the author selects a number of types and constructs situations which recur ordinarily in clerical circles. The lessons held in mind are brought out through action, views and arguments in a smoothly flowing and interesting narrative. Pastors, assistants, diocesan officials, seminary professors, the prison chaplain, the elderly pastor whose present efficiency is hardly equal to his past services, and a benevolent, zealous archbishop, are the types employed by Dr. Heuser to set forth his interpretations of priestly service to the reader. The shrewd philosophizing valet of the archbishop appears in the group and contributes in no small degree in bringing the story close to clerical life. The idealism that inspires *The Archbishop's*

[5] Conc. Trid., Sess. 13, Cap. 7: Cap. 4: Can. 1, Can. 2, Can. 3; S. th. 3, qu. 75, AA. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Pocketbook is represented in a way that brings it within the easy reach of intelligent good will.

The criticisms that are offered are never sharp. They are picked out of everyday life. Hints on reading and suggestions as to helpful literature grow naturally out of the situations which the author creates for his purposes. If the priest who reads this volume will look for himself among the characters and will read with an open mind, he will be brought close to ecclesiastical ideals and will be helped in the correction of many minor faults that ordinarily escape attention.

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL WORK. By the Rev. John O'Grady, Ph.D. The Century Catholic College Texts. The Century Co.: New York. Pp. 398. 1928.

In the editor's preface to this volume, Dr. John A. Lapp writes: "This is the first attempt, so far as the editor of this series is informed, on the part of a Catholic writer to give a comprehensive view of the whole field of social work and to integrate the Charities of the Catholic Church in their proper relationship to the public and non-sectarian agencies of welfare". These words admirably describe the scope and purpose of Dr. O'Grady's book.

The need for such a work has long been felt. In the last few decades welfare movements have made great strides. Some estimate that the social welfare program of the United States to-day is a three billion dollar business. During this advance, the Church has not been inactive. New charities under her auspices have multiplied. Central diocesan agencies for planning and direction have sprung into being in dozens of dioceses. To meet the demand for training, Catholic schools of social service have been established. Altogether, there has been a very evident growth of interest on the part of our priests, our sisters, and the laity, particularly Catholic college students, in the problems of social welfare.

Dr. Kerby has written that "All great social interests produce literature". In the field of charity, Catholics are rich in the literature of inspiration. We have in recent years been gradually creating a literature which also includes direction, investigation, and interpretation. The *Proceedings* of the National Conference of Catholic Charities contain the best of Catholic opinion on mooted topics. Monthly, the *Catholic Charities Review* is bringing forward the views, experiences and policies of our social agencies. Studies of certain institutions, dioceses and even, in a national way, of particular fields of activity have added much to our store of knowledge. The works of Kerby, Ryan, Husslein, Moore, Furfey, Lapp,

Cooley and Bramer represent mature and important contributions to social science.

The task undertaken by Dr. O'Grady was not an easy one. He acted wisely in selecting the title "An Introduction to Social Work", for he could not have hoped to sound the depths in the various channels of social endeavor. His chapters touch on work with families, the care of children, the prevention and treatment of crime, health movements, industrial problems, the socialized school, recreation, community organization, the charities of the Church, and public welfare activities. Almost every one of these topics has been the subject of many books by non-Catholic authors. Dr. O'Grady's book is a compendium for Catholic readers who are not in a position to take up these matters in detail. It gives a panoramic view of the whole field of social welfare in the United States.

After an opening chapter in which is set forth the basis of charity and the scope of social work, the author devotes three chapters to modern family life and social case work. He treats the sociological bearing on family life of industrial, recreational and neighborhood conditions, of divorce, desertion, and child marriages. His references in this and other sections to the relations of priests to social workers and social agencies are marked by a sympathetic understanding of the difficulties and problems which are frequently encountered. Social case work he defined as "the art of ministering to persons who have a great variety of needs, which, of themselves, they cannot satisfy directly or through normal agencies, through a complete understanding of these needs and through the fullest possible use of their own resources and the resources of the community". While this long definition is fairly descriptive, it fails to include the effort to engender the self-help and independence that characterize good case work.

The process of social investigation is carefully covered in the sections dealing with the sources of helpful information concerning the family. However, little attention is given to the other steps which go to make up social case work, namely, analysis of information, diagnosis of the problem, listing of resources, planning of treatment, securing the family's coöperation, supervision, and readjustment of plan.

The four chapters dealing with children and children's courts sum up the forces at work in the lives of dependent, neglected and delinquent children and the measures which have been found most effective in their care. Very good use is made of recent literature on these topics. The trends in mothers' allowance legislation are traced. Practical standards for institutions, foster-home placing,

and juvenile courts are briefly given. A summary of the findings of Drs. Healy and Bronner in their studies of juvenile offenders is used as a basis for judging the relative influence of various factors in the lives of youthful transgressors. In treating institutional standards greater emphasis should have been placed on aftercare. No mention is made of the importance of legislative provision that children should be placed only in institutions or foster homes of their own religion.

Many will feel that the chapter on "The Social Treatment of Crime" should have been given a somewhat broader treatment. A great deal has been covered in a concise way but some important processes are passed over quickly. There is a lack of case examples such as helped to lighten the chapters dealing with family service. Likewise, in dealing with health facilities, the author confines himself to the essentials of many great health movements. A vast field ranging from public health programs and health education to hospital social service and the cost of sickness is covered in twenty pages. In the United States there are over 500 Catholic hospitals, with many clinics, dispensaries, nurses' training schools and social service departments. Add to these the fifteen visiting nurse sisterhoods and scores of convalescent homes. These extensive interests of the Church in the health field would indicate the advisability of giving more detailed information as modern health movements.

In dealing with the economic disabilities of the wage earner, Dr. O'Grady gives evidence of the intensive work which he has done on the problems confronting labor and industry. The sections on wages and wage legislation, hours of labor, child labor, workman's compensation and social insurance for sickness, old age and unemployment, show that he is thoroughly at home in this field. They will give to students a good understanding of the conditions underlying much of the distress which social agencies are called on to relieve.

Few writers have had the opportunity afforded to the author as Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities to know the charities of the Church throughout the country. In his two chapters on "The Church and Social Work," he has not only given a summary of the extent and history of these works, but has set forth the ideals and policies which should govern our parish, institutional and diocesan charities. They are written in practical, concrete terms and should prove valuable to both Catholics and non-Catholics engaged in charitable work.

Under the heading, "Public Welfare in the United States", the author deals with public outdoor relief, the development of the alms-

house and public care for the feebleminded, the insane and the sick. He then takes up the welfare functions of the state and its relation to private agencies. Other chapters are concerned with the poor and the law, the school as a social agency, leisure-time activities and community organizations of the nature of councils of social agencies and community chests. Though the treatment is necessarily cursory, much useful information of an elementary character is imparted.

To facilitate use as a college text each chapter is followed by a list of problems which may be assigned to students for study and also by a bibliography. These latter are rather extensive but would be of greater value if a short description were given of each reference.

The printing and set-up of the book are pleasing and make it very readable. The sectional headings are well chosen. For greater clarity, it is suggested that in later editions the case synopses be set apart, indented and printed in smaller type. Thus, the statement of cases could be more easily distinguished from comment and treatment. On pages 57 and 80, long series of items might well be listed. On pages 286 and 291, the use of footnotes would relieve the text of monotonous lists of organizations.

In describing controversies over social policies, Dr. O'Grady tries to state both sides fairly. Sometimes, however, he puts forward certain propositions as if they were universally accepted, whereas in reality the opposition to some of them is substantial. Of such a nature is the statement on page 39, where after referring to the opinion of priests and social workers, he says: "It is recognized that the legal minimum age for marriage should be sixteen for girls and eighteen for boys." Many will concede the advisability of restricting marriages below these ages without approving absolute prohibition. On page 131, he says: "The best child-caring agencies agree that foster homes should be visited at least once a month." This is true for boarding or temporary homes but not for free permanent homes. Many also will disagree with his views on page139: "When a judge is selected with special reference to his qualifications to deal with children, and when he gives his undivided attention to the work, the juvenile court which is a branch of another court, can secure all the advantages of the independent court." Limitations of powers and procedure are very likely to hamper such a judge. Finally on page 141, Dr. O'Grady gives unqualified approval to the extension of children's court jurisdiction to cases of youthful offenders up to eighteen years of age. Some different procedure for cases between sixteen and eighteen may be advisable, but it is not clear that they should be brought into the children's court.

The book manifests the author's contacts with a great number of different social agencies and his understanding of their objectives and methods. As a pioneer work by a Catholic author, it will help to meet a great need. Individual social workers may feel that it throws no new light on the special problems in their own department. One must bear in mind that the book is intended as a Catholic college text covering only the salient points in social work. As such, it should prove very instructive and useful as a text in our seminaries, novitiates, and colleges. It will, moreover, be of great help to the religious engaged in charitable work and to the clergy who, in parish and diocesan life, must face so many of the problems treated within its pages.

A PRIMER OF THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. By the Rev. Michael Canon Cronin, M.A., D.D., P.P., author of "The Science of Ethics". M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. 1927. Pp. viii-120.

If Catholics have the duty, as stated by Pope Leo XIII, "to take the initiative in all true social progress . . . and to be the champions of the eternal principles of justice and Christian civilization"; if in the regeneration of society Pius XI calls upon them to be "the torch-bearers of the truth"—it is vital that they have a clear and accurate conception of the basic social principles that inevitably flow from the well-spring of the Master's teachings. In *A Primer of the Principles of Social Science*, Dr. Cronin attempts the task of acquainting his readers with these fundamental principles and the elementary problems of social science. Restricting his treatment of the subject mainly "to man as a member of the family" and more particularly to questions relative to private property, the author renders the work rather unsatisfactory as a general introductory text to the study of the principles of social science, even did it not suffer from more fundamental limitations.

Both in theory and in practice the concept of social justice is much less developed than commutative justice. Too many authors have been prone to stress or even exaggerate the individual natural rights of private property while overlooking its social obligations. Dr. Cronin in his division of justice, stating that "there are two kinds, commutative and distributive," apparently ignores legal or social justice which in Thomistic social philosophy plays such an important rôle in determining the nature and extent of most of our social rights and duties. This omission possibly explains such statements contained in the work as, "Under the present system of private ownership the things produced all over the world find

their way to their proper owners automatically" (p. 44); "The wages paid to his employee covers no doubt the employer's whole duty in justice" (p. 111); "The man who owns the factory is owner of what he produces, provided of course he has paid the agreed wage to his workmen" (p. 78); "Ownership, as such, implies the right to complete control, so that, if no other obligation intervene, a man may do what he likes with his own" (p. 40), for "to give superfluous things to one not in extreme need he regards as a counsel of perfection not as an obligation of any kind, either of justice or charity".

Statements such as these fail to interpret accurately Leo XIII's doctrine of wage justice or the trust obligation of private ownership. While stressing the fundamental right of private property the Pope insists equally on its social obligations. Had Dr. Cronin kept in mind the pregnant words of *Rerum novarum* that "the blessings of nature and of grace belong in common to the whole human race," and that "whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of temporal blessings, whether they be external, corporeal, or gifts of mind, has received them for the purpose of perfecting his own nature and at the same time that he may use them as the steward of God's Providence for the benefit of others", he surely would not have claimed that the owner of superfluous goods, apart from duties toward those in extreme need, is not under "an obligation of any kind either in justice or charity".

BAPTEME ET CONFIRMATION. Par Adhémar d'Alès, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Paris: Bloud et Gay. 1927. Pp. 192.

An excellent little manual on the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation comes to us in Adhémar d'Alès' *Baptême et Confirmation.* In the foreword we are informed that the present book contains in a practical and abbreviated form the substance of a larger Latin treatise published by the author for ecclesiastical students. This abbreviated edition in French is destined for the lay reader. While avoiding all unnecessary technicalities, it is both complete and clear, and presents in attractive form the entire theological treatises on Baptism and Confirmation. The author follows the usual order found in Scholastic text books and uses a modern method of Scholastic exposition and reasoning aided by the important data furnished by history. The volume contains six chapters on Baptism and one on Confirmation, with an Appendix in which is ably commented St. Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus.* The French reading public is fortunate to have at its disposal such excellent manuals of

Christian doctrine as have been lately published in well edited series. This one belongs to the series " Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses.". We cannot but wish that our English-speaking Catholics were as well supplied with reading matter on the essentials of their religion.

LE CHRIST, VIE ET LUMIERE. Commentaire spirituel de l'Evangile de Saint Jean. Par P. Augustin Chometon, S.J., Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1927. Pp. 556.

An abundant commentary on St. John's Gospel is offered in *Le Christ, Vie et Lumière*, by the Rev. Augustin Chometon, S.J. In his foreword, the author distinguishes his work from that of the scientific exegetist who " according to St. Jerome's rule, applies himself to throw light on obscure passages and goes rapidly over those which present no difficulty ". Father Chometon's aim is to find out and explain the spiritual sense derived from the literal, for not a line, indeed not a word, of the Gospel but contains some spiritual treasure with which to enrich our soul. With this in view, he proceeds to comment on the whole Gospel of St. John, verse by verse, and no one can doubt either his vast knowledge of the wealth of doctrine hidden in the fourth Gospel, or his powers of amplification. Perhaps the greatest hindrance to the popularity of this commentary would be its very abundance: five hundred and fifty closely printed, octavo pages may not appeal, as readily as the pious author optimistically believes, to the " Jeunes ", even if it is true that " no one as well as they can feel enthusiasm for that unique and sovereign beauty that is our Lord ". Too much is too much, and the sight of a superabundance of viands does not habitually tend to whet a blasé appetite. This bulky volume, which is really excellent in theological and spiritual doctrine, would enormously gain in popularity and bring forth much more fruit if it were carefully revised and cut down to about half its present size.

UNE RETRAITE sous la conduite de Saint Jean de la Croix, en union avec Sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus et Soeur Elisabeth de la Trinité. Par Mère Marie du Saint Sacrement, du Carmel de Mangalore. P. Lethielleux: Paris. 1927. Pp. 384.

This excellent volume by the Mother Prioress of the Carmelite convent of Mangalore, India, furnishes the material for a retreat of ten days, and deserves to be recommended to priests, religious and seminarians. Each day contains four meditations and a spiritual reading, the latter taken from the Life and Works of St. John

of the Cross and specially adapted to each day of the exercises. A series of ten additional meditations and six spiritual readings, with two tables giving a special arrangement of the matter for two retreats of eight days, make the volume particularly practical for people who can ill afford the spiritual luxury of a ten-days' retreat. The doctrine is sound and sensible, ably adapted from the works of the Mystical Doctor, and while its austerity and altitude may not appeal to the taste of the common grade Christians, it will be appreciated and relished by souls addicted to mental prayer, self-discipline and the contemplation of divine things. The reader is offered as encouraging models in the use of the rugged doctrine of St. John of the Cross, two celebrated Carmelite nuns, St. Theresa of the Child Jesus and Sister Elisabeth of the Trinity, whose own sweet virtue has been nourished in the vigorous writings of their saintly Father and Founder. May the "Little Flower", so justly popular with our readers, inspire them with a desire to draw from the rich fountain where she herself drank so deeply.

S. THOMAS D'AQUIN. By Edgar de Bruyne. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1928. Pp. 348.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this work. It possesses the good qualities of Sertillanges and Grabmann, and is more up to date than either of these well known studies. Professor de Bruyne has made his own the most recent researches on St. Thomas and shows everywhere in his work an exact and sound appreciation of the present state of knowledge concerning the Angelic Doctor. It is the type of study which, if translated into English (and this should be done as soon as possible), would do a great deal to make Thomism known and respected in circles where little is known with exactness of this philosophy.

The work is divided into three parts of unequal length. The first section treats of the ambient in which St. Thomas lived, with particular emphasis on the university life of the thirteenth century. The disputes between secular and religious clergy at the University of Paris are detailed and their influence on contemporary thought brought out. This is a subject about which much has been written recently and De Bruyne has succeeded in summarizing well the results of our most recent researches. In the second part the author traces the life and activities of St. Thomas according to approved sources and the latest information. In a few but masterly pages he brings out the sources of Thomism and exhibits the synthetic unity of Thomistic thought. The third section is devoted to an exposition of the Thomistic "vision du monde". Being, God,

human nature, and the moral life are expounded according to the teachings of St. Thomas. The exposition is not polemical, nor does the author claim that his interpretation is in every case the only acceptable one. The work loses nothing by not being encumbered by a great mass of foot-notes and citations. The bibliography is select and well chosen.

De Bruyne's *St. Thomas* is the type of book which will do more to make intelligible and acceptable Thomism as a system than a hundred dry compendia. It is recommended highly as collateral reading for all university students of philosophy.

SAINT IRENEE. Par L. Cristiani. Paris: La Bonne Presse. 1927. Pp. 91.

The church of Lyons venerates in St. Irenaeus its purest glory and one of its founders; France regards him as one of her first apostles, and the Universal Church, as one of her great teachers and marytrs. An ever-growing interest centres around this apostolic bishop, an Asiatic governing a Western Church, one who had heard the last echoes of the preaching of the Apostles and seen the last survivors of Christ's contemporaries. Abbé L. Cristiani, Dean of the Faculty of Letters at the Catholic University of Lyons, presents to us in this little volume an attractive image of the great martyr bishop. With charming simplicity, historical accuracy and elegance of language, he gives us on the youth, priesthood, episcopate and activities of St. Irenaeus just what is needed to render popular the life of that illustrious saint whom the Church honors as one of her ablest defenders.

LA FOI ET SA JUSTIFICATION RATIONNELLE. Par Gabriel Brunhes, Professeur au Grand Séminaire de Dijon. Paris: Bloud et Gay. 1927. Pp. 231.

This new volume by the distinguished professor of apologetics of the Dijon Seminary is conceived in the same spirit as his preceding study entitled *Christianisme et Catholicisme*, a simple synthesis, profound withal and harmonious, placing with clearness and elegance of expression at the disposal of people of moderate culture the results of the work of Catholic philosophers and theologians.

That the acquiring of faith is rationally grounded, the Catholic Church has never ceased to proclaim; but, in order firmly to establish the legitimacy of that assertion, it is first indispensable to agree on the concept of faith, so many and so divergent being the vagaries of contemporary thought on the subject. Faith is said by some

to be a mere sentiment, a more or less obscure feeling of the human heart, which error causes some to experience an attraction toward it in their aversion for intellectualism, while it prompts others to reject it contemptuously. On the other hand, taking a pretext from the Church's doctrine that faith is a divine gift, some conclude that faith is arbitrarily granted or refused, the will and intellect of man playing no part in the process; another error which presents the danger of inducing certain modern apologists to rely too much on the rational demonstration, forgetting the all-important part of divine grace.

The object of the volume is therefore, in its first part, to gather all the various portions of truth contained in those diverging errors in order to show, in accordance with the Catholic teaching, that faith is a marvelous combination of the divine grace with human intelligence and good will. The second part enables the reader thus enlightened to study the rational justification of faith, presenting its difficulties, the methods of dealing with the problems of modern apologetics, and the respective human value and divine origin of faith. An abbreviated bibliography of the most accessible works on the subject completes the volume.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER. The Rev. George Schurhammer, S.J. Freely adapted from the German by Frank J. Eble, M.A. B. Herder Book Co.; St. Louis, Mo. 1928. Pp. vii + 321.

Perhaps none of our popular devotional works are apt to arouse more widespread interest and to produce more satisfying results than well written lives of the saints. The present volume is a commendable addition to the increasing list of such biographies. It is presented to the public as "a plain, popular and unadorned narrative," produced because "the author could no longer resist the urgent request of those admirers of the saint who desired to have a reliable short biography as soon as possible." A larger, duly documented biography in four volumes is to be published later. St. Francis Xavier has made an almost universal appeal to the people of our times, and the recently awakened mission spirit of our own country has made the Patron of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith a particular favorite of American Catholics. This timely biography will acquaint its readers with the character and accomplishments of the saint, and also nourish their love for the world-wide missions of the Church. The material is divided into thirty-nine chapters and is supplemented by a Table of Contents and an Index.

Literary Chat

Those who are interested in the series of spiritual classics known as the "Orchard Books", in course of publication by Benziger Brothers, will be glad to welcome three little volumes which have appeared recently — *The Scale of Perfection* by Walter Hilton, pp. 403; *The Secret Paths of Divine Love* by Father Constantine Barbanson, pp. 244; *The Mirror of Simple Souls* by an unknown French Mystic of the thirteenth century, pp. 303. Each volume contains an historical introduction which relates the work to its time and explains its mission. The volumes are commended by convenient size, very good paper and type. They offer refreshing reading to all who find, in interior life, problems that invite earnest attention. Penetration into spiritual processes, the steps by which the earnest soul advances toward perfection, and the claims of Love of God on all life, are set forth in a way to compel careful reading and reflection. And not the least of the charms of the series will be found in the way in which voices from the distant past, the ages of Faith, tell the reader of the fidelity with which the authors heard and obeyed the call of God to His unfaltering service.

A new volume for children and lovers of children, the product of present-day Faith, may be mentioned as worthy of comparison in many ways with the spiritual classics just mentioned (*I Belong to God,* by Lillian Clark. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. Pp. 123). The work contains a series of meditations for children, in large type and illustrated in a charming way by drawings of Claire Armstrong, who catches and represents the impulses and feelings of children with skill. The text interprets spiritual truths in relation to the experiences of childhood in an appealing manner. The reading of the work is a delight for adults. After all, we must become like little children in our search after spiritual vision. His Eminence Cardinal Hayes writes a letter commending the volume, and the Foreword is by the Very Rev. Joseph McSorley, Superior General of the Paulist Fathers.

We are at times disconcerted by lack of interest among the laity in the story of the Gospel which contains the authentic and inspired Life of Christ. Perhaps lack of interest on the part of the clergy is a greater challenge to our understanding. Recognizing this, Father F. J. Remler, C.M., has published a volume of 312 pages in the hope of promoting among the laity serious attention to the Gospel narrative (*The Gospel for the Laity.* B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis). The author describes his plan as follows: "Our Divine Lord is throughout kept before the reader's mind, as the Teacher of Eternal Salvation. Salvation is the one great theme that He explains. In fourteen chapters and a number of sub-divisions this subject is developed and various passages bearing on the several points are quoted. In this way each point is illustrated by a formidable array of sayings and teachings with which the Wisdom of God was pleased to instruct us in the Science of Salvation."

Father Remler's volume takes its place in a growing body of literature which deals with the problem that engages him. It would serve admirably as the basis of a series of sermons or conferences on the Life of our Divine Lord, not an easy task by any means. We are so accustomed to doctrinal explanation and emotional appeal in preaching that a careful exposition of the life of Jesus, carried over a long period, seems to be a difficult task, yet the Personality of our Divine Saviour remains always infinitely attractive. Spiritual truth, if it is to hold attention, must be so presented as to be saved against commonplace expression. If the members of a congregation respond quickly to a sermon which shows depth, sympathy, mastery of thought and expression, and they do this, the awakening of their interest in spiritual things awaits our adequate efforts.

What could do more to effect this than a series of thoughtful sermons

on the life of Christ, prepared along the lines of *The Gospel for the Laity*. The commendation of this work, following such a course, would do much to realize the author's purpose. The American habit of keeping religious feelings to oneself does much to outlaw spiritual subjects from conversation. Yet deep conviction and feeling tend of their very nature to appear in conversation. How can it be that the power, charm and marvels of Christ's life rarely if ever appear in familiar social intercourse in the home or elsewhere among the laity. It is to this isolation of spiritual topics out of everyday life that we must look for an explanation of the indifference that Father Remler laments.

We owe to the pen of George N. Shuster, Associate Editor of *The Commonweal*, a very stimulating volume (*The Catholic Spirit in America*. The Dial Press, New York. Pp. 296). The aim of the author is "to make it possible for Catholics to go a little farther outside of their Church circles — to help bring about the day when they can participate more openly, fruitfully and industriously in the nation's political, moral, social and creative business than they do now. And if that involves for many a closer view of the Church than they have as yet gained, I know that countless Americans are sufficiently interested in their civilization to give a little of their time to such adventure."

The author, who is a literary journalist, brings within the range of his treatment Immigration, Bigotry, Literature, Protestantism, American and Catholic Principles, Public Opinion, Press, Education, American and Catholic Culture. He offers primarily commentaries on life and discusses doctrines as they appear in living. When such a wide field is covered and one deals with interpretations primarily, the author can hardly hope that his readers will follow him throughout. But he will stimulate them to do their own thinking in a field of wider relations to which little attention has perhaps been given. And this is a service which any author might be proud to render.

Congregations of "Clerics Regular" and societies of secular priests which have become such a conspicuous feature of the post-Tridentine Church are the subject of the compact little volume offered to the general reading public by Canon Paul Pisani, Dean of the Metropolitan Chapter of Paris. These congregations or societies were founded with the purpose of remedying the abuses and carelessness into which the secular as well as the regular clergy of the pre-Reformation period had admittedly fallen. That they were needed and timely is abundantly shown by the history of their progress and development, no less than by the bountiful harvest of souls that they have garnered. The period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the golden age of these foundations, and other institutions with similar spirit, organization and purpose, were later established, after the models supplied by St. Cajetanus, St. Ignatius, St. Philip Neri, St. Vincent de Paul, and St. Alphonsus. This little book, *Les Compagnies des Prêtres des XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ Siècles* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1927, pp. 191), gives the history of all these societies, and while it offers nothing strikingly new to anyone who has read a good Church history manual, the reader will appreciate the convenience of having that interesting story in a handy and well edited volume.

Priests and directors of sodalities often wish for a new manual of devotions for the month of May. The Abbé J. de Martrin-Donos, the venerable curé-archiprêtre of Notre Dame de Bon Port, Les Sables d'Olonne, presents a new Month of Mary in his *Nouveau Mois de Marie: des Gloires de la Très Sainte Vierge* (Avignon: Aubanel, Fils Aîné. Pp. 150). The usual plan of this sort of manual is here followed: each day contains a short meditation followed by a prayer, an edifying story as "example", and appropriate resolutions and invocations. The originality of this new effort is that it consists in a running spiritual commentary on the "Salve Regina", detailing the principal glories of the Blessed Virgin, according to the famous treatise of St. Alphonsus de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary*. The pious author, who modestly confesses to having already written "nearly a dozen" other Months

of Mary, deserves a new meed of praise and thanks from his confrères for this last one. May he live many more years and continue his devoted apostolate in honor of Our Blessed Mother!

Memento de Vie religieuse, by Monsignor Alcime Gouraud, Bishop of Vannes (Paris: Lethielleux, 1927. Second edition, pp. 320), is intended as a manual of personal recollection for nuns who have already for some time lived the religious life, and wish to renew their attachment to those fundamental principles which were taught them in their novitiate year, and on which their whole life rests. It covers a period of three weeks, in which are successively studied the nature of religious life, its obligations and its supports. Each period contains three exercises for each day in the week, an instruction, a meditation and a spiritual examination on the subject chosen. The book is written in simple and clear style, is rich in theological and spiritual doctrine, and should prove useful not only to the religious themselves but also to priests who assume their direction. It might also be appropriately recommended to young persons aspiring to the religious life.

School books containing questions and answers in all the preliminary branches and in the high school subjects are published by W. Hazleton Smith, Buffalo, New York, under the general title of *Smith's Regents Review Books*. Teachers will find in these little volumes the examination questions asked by the Board of Regents of the State of New York on some subjects since 1892 and on others since 1904. In separate little volumes the answers to these questions are printed. These booklets are already well known and favorably received in many classrooms not only in New York State but throughout the Union.

In the August number of the REVIEW, a correspondent called attention to the authorized English version of the prayer to be recited at the foot of the altar after low Mass. A durable card, giving the correct text of the prayer in question, is published in neat style by Frederick Pustet Co., New York.

Books Received

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

CHRIST IN THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. Bible and Catechism Combined. By Sister Mary Gonzaga, Ph.D., Member of the Community of the Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ. With a Preface by the Right Rev. John F. Noll, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1928. Pp. xvi—697. Price, $3.00 *net*.

A DAUGHTER OF THE CROSS. Life and Mystical Letters of Sister Emilie. By the Rev. C. Richstaetter, S.J. Translated by F. C. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1928. Pp. vii—311. Price, $2.90 postpaid.

JUS DIGESTORUM, Additis jurium nostri temporis praesertim Juris Canonici adnotationibus e Praelectiones quas in Schola "Textus" Juris Romani habebat Sac. Socius Doct. d'Angelo, Antecessor Juris Civilis in Facultate Juridica Pont. Seminarii Romani, Professor Diplomatiae apud Pont. Academiam Nobilium Ecclesiasticorum, Supremi Tribunalis Signaturae Ap. Praelatus Referendarius, Judex Prosynodalis Vicariatus Urbis, Officialis S. Congregationis Concilii. Tomus II: Partes Speciales. Vol. I: De Juribus Realibus. (*Athenaeum Pontificii Seminarii Romani ad "S. Apollinaris" in Urbe.*) Lega Italiana Cattolica Editrice, Taurin. 1928. Pp. xiii—276. Pretium, *Lib.* 18.

S. FRANÇOIS DE SALES, 1567-1622. By E. K. Sanders. Macmillan Co., New York. 1928. Pp. x—304. Price, $3.75.

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., Principal of Regent's Park College (London and Oxford). (*The Library of Constructive Theology.* Theological Editors: W. R. Matthews, D.D. and H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. General Editor: Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D.) Harper & Bros., New York and London. 1928. Pp. xviii—295. Price, $3.00.

THE CASE FOR CHRISTIANITY. An Outline of Popular Apologetics. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, University of London. Harper & Bros., New York and London. 1928. Pp. 278. Price, $3.00.

HANDBUCH DES KATHOLISCHEN EHERECHTS. Auf Grund des Codex Iuris Canonici und unter Berücksichtigung des Bürgerlichen Eherechts des Deutschen Reiches, Österreichs, Ungarns, der Tschechoslowakei und der Schweiz. Bearbeitet von August Knecht, Dr. Theol. et Iur. Utr., Universitätsprofessor in München. B. Herder Book Co., Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis. 1928. Pp. xi—812. Price, $9.00 *net.*

PRACTICA DE LA PIEDAD LITURGICA. Para Uso de los Alumnos de los Colegios y Demas Fieles que Deseen Acomodar sus Devociones a la Sagrada Liturgia. Por el P. D. Alfonso M.ª Gubianas, O.S.B., Monje de Montserrat. Tipografia Catolica Casals, Barcelona. 1928. Pp. xi—566. Precio, 6 *pesetas.*

PHILOSOPHICAL.

RELIGION AND THE COMMONWEAL. An Analysis of the Social Economy of Religion. By Herbert Maynard Diamond, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Lehigh University. Harper & Bros., New York and London. 1928. Pp. xx—305. Price, $2.00.

COSMOLOGY. A Text for Colleges. By J. A. McWilliams, S.J. Macmillan Co., New York. 1928. Pp. x—243. Price, $2.50.

HISTORICAL.

AMERICA. By the Rev. Philip J. Furlong, Ph.D., Professor of History, Cathedral College, New York. Foreword by the Right Rev. Joseph F. Smith, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of New York. Illustrations in color by Thomas Fogarty. A Textbook for the Upper Grades of the Elementary Schools. William H. Sadlier, New York. 1928. Pp. xii—643. Price, $1.28 *net.*

THE LIFE OF THE SERVANT OF GOD PIUS X. By the Very Rev. Don Benedetto Pierami, of the Benedictines of Vallombrosa, Abbot of St. Praxede. Published under the auspices of the Postulator-General. With a Preface by Baron Ludwig von Pastor. Casa Editrice Marietti, Turin (118) and Rome (119). 1928. Pp. xv—214. Price: paper cover, 3 *shillings*; cloth, 4 *shillings.*

CATHOLIC LOYALTY IN ELIZABETHAN DAYS. By Cardinal Francis Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster. Catholic Truth Society, London, S.W. 1. 1928. Pp. 8. Price, 1 *penny.*

SEIJI NOMA, "MAGAZINE KING" OF JAPAN. A Sketch of His Life, Character and Enterprises. Dai Nippon Yubenkwai Kodansha, Tokyo. 1927. Pp. iv—36.

MISCELLANEOUS.

TWOPENNY PAMPHLETS: B35, *The Carthusian Martyrs.* By Dom Lawrence Hendriks. Pp. 32. B145, *A Sister of Charity (Sœur Rosalie, 1787-1856).* By Lady Herbert. Pp. 24. C124, *"The Scarlet Woman"*, or *The Methods of a Protestant Novelist.* By James Britten, K.C.S.G. Pp. 24. D145, *Petit Paroissien.* Nouvelle edition. Pp. 75. H121, *Some Welsh Martyrs.* By the Rev. Joseph Murphy, S.J. Pp. 24. M8, *Kindness to Animals.* By E. M. Grange. Pp. 32. Catholic Truth Society, London, S.W., 1. 1928. Price, *twopence* each.